

were sent out, to be put up on billboards. What was on them? As I drove into the city along Jackson Boulevard I stopped and took a good look.

There was a reproduction of a picture which had been taken at the Jefferson jubilee in the Chicago Stadium. What was in it? It showed the President of the United States holding up the hand of Scott Lucas. Underneath were the words, "For peace and prosperity—Truman and Lucas."

As it was being put up young men were dying upon the slimy and frozen bosom of Korea. Yet the Democrats have the effrontery to say that we are the war party, and that they are the party of peace, serenity, and tranquillity.

Never has the spirit of America been so tumultuous. Never has the soul of America been filled with such turbulence; and never has there been such a thread of disunity in our country as exists at the present time.

How interesting to catch those echoes. The Republican Party is the party of war, and the Democratic Party is the party of peace. I should like to see them popularize that tag in the minds of the free men and free women of America, in the light of what has happened in the past few days. My own mail reached a peak of 15,500 letters in a single day.

So the Democratic Party is the party of peace. There is the naked record in 1916. There is the record in 1941. There is the record in 1950. Peace? Yes; they have kept peace on a war footing for so long that one would think that the American people and the American economy must have a great deal of robustness and resiliency to stand up to it. Their kind of peace is a period of toil to pay heavy taxes for the last war and to get ready—God forbid—for whatever else may come along.

There are many things in short supply, as Senators know. Our business men are trying to get a little copper, a little aluminum, a little nickel, or a little cobalt. But there are other things besides the critical materials which are in short supply. One of them is peace. What kind of peace? Peace with bankruptcy. Peace with death. Peace with confusion. Peace with socialism. Peace with a garrison state. Peace with tension. Did not General Marshall say that we might look forward to 10 or 20 years of tensions? Peace with humiliation and with the bankruptcy of every fine illusion that good Americans by the millions had in their hearts as they began to repeat all the fine expressions in the Atlantic Charter. Peace? Yes.

It seems that the only things which are in long supply at this moment, when they talk of peace, are the white crosses which mark the last holy resting place of thousands of fine American boys.

What a tragedy it is. I wish it had never been said, so that it would not be necessary to make answer in order to keep the record straight; but it has been said, and I think it becomes a matter of self-respect for any Republican with a conscience to rebut such statements and

make sure that the record is very accurate and very exact as the issues are tested in the great political arena of America, in the days which lie ahead. I want to stand up and be counted on this question. So long as I have any energy and any talent, as I observe and read the record of my own generation, with two world wars, and casualties mounting even now in history's greatest police action, I shall say: Let us meet the issue squarely and show what party is the party of peace and what party is the party of war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to break in on the very fine and forceful speech the Senator from Illinois is making, but I ask him if it is not a fact that the present war in Korea, which is now being termed a war, is President Truman's war?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He sent the troops there, and he certainly did not consult with Congress when that happened.

Mr. WHERRY. So in order to make the RECORD clear, the Senator can include in his statement that the war in Korea is President Truman's war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The facts speak for themselves. That issue we shall meet, and I shall be glad to meet it.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator, of course, has clearly pointed out the situations as they exist under the theme he has adopted, but I wonder if he would object to adding, or if he agrees that there might be added another phrase to the various accompaniments of peace which he denominated a moment ago, such as "peace with socialism"; "peace with bankruptcy"; peace with various other things which I cannot now recall. Does he think there could be added another, the philosophy of the administration, which is "peace with war"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. "Peace with war." Yes; and on that basis we can say "They got us into peace again."

#### RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John C. LeDoux  
Robert H. Miller  
Robert A. Litke

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Arthur T. Buch, Temple Emanuel, Paterson, N. J., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost grant salvation to kings bless and protect the leaders of our Republic where the graces of nobility are the simple virtues that attend the good. Here in the greatest capital in the history of the world—greater than any palace or parliament—these our leaders stand proudly, yet humbly; proudly in the tradition of Washington and Lincoln against any oppression or oppressor, and humbly in Thy presence.

It is this humility before Thee, O God, which renders this Congress the great hope of mankind for freedom, justice, and peace. It is this dependence on Thee which calls forth our prayer, rising like the blue incense unto Thee.

In this hour of menace, be with our Nation, and our Nation's arms. If in war, grant us that for which, it has been said, there is no substitute—grant us victory; but grant us the right kind of victory, not a wingless or pyrrhic one, but one that makes our national sacrifices insure an international peace, with freedom and justice for all.

To this end, in this hour of danger, may it be Thy side that is spoken for when the floor is taken so that the voice of a united America shall be heard the world 'round as an echo of the voice of God.

Then, indeed, shall God bless America and all mankind. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE GEN. CHARLES G. DAWES

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sad yet proud tribute to note the passing of a great American, my fellow townsman, my close neighbor, Gen. Charles G. Dawes.

General Dawes, born in Marietta, Ohio, on August 27, 1865, spanned nearly a century of American history. For over 60 years of public service, serving under six Presidents, he wrote his own contribution to that history.

Though noted and loved as an industrialist, as a civic leader, as a banker, as an author, and as a musician and composer, it is for his indelible record of public service that he will long be held by his country in deep respect. Beginning as Comptroller of the Currency; Director of the Budget; as brigadier general purchasing agent for the AEF in the First World War; as head of the Dawes Commission for settlement of German reparation problems after that war; he became in quick turn Vice President of the United States; Ambassador to Great Britain; Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There was no opening too big for him to accept;



there was no achievement which he seemed unable to accomplish. Yet I assure you today that in Evanston, Ill., he is not being mourned merely for his public service; he is being mourned as a beloved neighbor who always had time to help everyone, whose door was always open for every discussion of Americanism; and who, even at 85, contributed to the youth and spirit of his home community. A full legislative session would not suffice to read his record into the pages of this Congress, nor would it give time for all who wish to speak to pay their tribute.

I would merely hope that in these days when an harassed world stands so in need of courage, conviction, personal sacrifice, and leadership, we might inherit one small whit of what Gen. Charles G. Dawes, former Vice President of the United States, contributed to his age and to his country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the representatives from the great State of Illinois in expressing my sincere regrets at the death of its first citizen of the State, Hon. Charles G. Dawes. He was an outstanding leader of the country in business, in finance, and in politics.

It was my privilege to know him intimately for over 23 years and to be honored by his friendship.

He was a builder in the finest sense of the word. He wanted to make his city of Chicago a great business center and he devoted his extraordinary talents to this purpose. He was a kindly man and was generous in his support of education, music and every charitable appeal. He was one of the best types of philanthropist.

He was deeply interested in politics and government. He directed his energies in behalf of a better America. Despite his advanced age, he never lost his interest in national affairs. I recall speaking in Chicago on two successive evenings a year ago. He honored me with his presence on both occasions. Following the second meeting, he made a little impromptu talk that showed his keenness of mind and his intimate knowledge of our Government finances.

Charlie Dawes was Vice President of the United States from 1924 to 1928. He was strongly supported for the Presidency in 1928.

He belonged to that rugged type of Americans who fashioned our country into the great giant it is today.

We owe much to Charles G. Dawes. To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy. A great civic leader, an outstanding industrial leader, and a great American has departed.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to express the loss I feel with the passing of former Vice President of the United States, Gen. Charles Dawes. I knew him well. I counted him among my very best friends. He had a host of friends and just to be one of them has indeed been a great privilege.

Few men have contributed so much to our country. He has written a record of accomplishments that will stand forever as a monument to his memory. From birth he was endowed with both the will and the ability to succeed in whatever he undertook. His father, Rufus, who served with distinction in the Civil War, was a member of this body from the State of Ohio. His brother, Beman Gates Dawes, was also a member of this body.

It is impossible to recite the long list of accomplishments and the honors that have been conferred upon General Dawes. I know of few men who excelled in so many fields. He began his career practicing law and then became interested in banking. President McKinley appointed him Comptroller of the Currency when he was only 31 years of age. After returning from service in World War I, rising from the rank of major to the rank of brigadier general, he was made the first Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

We all know the contribution he made for establishing the peace after the war. He served as Chairman of the Reparations Committee, out of whose work the so-called Dawes Plan developed. For his work he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1925.

His was a busy life and yet he still had time to participate extensively in many civic affairs. He was never too busy to give the benefit of his wise counsel and sound advice to others.

He was born in Ohio but adopted Illinois as his home. We in Illinois are proud of him. We shall miss him. I have lost a personal friend and the country has lost a great leader.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that those who follow me may have the same privilege; also that all Members who wish to do so may have the opportunity of extending their remarks on General Dawes at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a great many citizens of Nebraska, I am sure, join me in expressing sorrow at the passing of Gen. Charles G. Dawes. It is true that the great State of Ohio can claim that General Dawes was born there and that Illinois was the scene of much of the later part of his life, however, we of Nebraska have always thought of General Dawes as a Nebraskan. General Dawes was a part of Nebraska and in turn Nebraska was a part of General Dawes' long and active life. Charles G. Dawes began his practice of law in Lincoln, Nebr., in 1887 and continued there until he moved to Evanston, Ill., in 1895.

Mr. Speaker, in the book entitled "Dawes the Doer" by Carl W. Ackerman, we find the following account:

After graduating from Marietta, and after successfully acting as civil engineer young Dawes decided to study law. Because Gen. J. D. Cox, a civil war comrade of his father, was dean of the Cincinnati Law School, and,

as one of Dawes' uncles was in business there he decided to attend this law school, paying his tuition and expenses out of the money he saved during his summer vacation as a civil engineer. Here he completed the 2-year legal course before he was old enough to be admitted to the bar.

"What did you do then, when you could not practice law?" I asked.

General Dawes looked at me with his penetrating eyes as much as to say it was none of my business, and then answered—"I waited until I was old enough," and the pale, sharp features of his face gave the first evidence of the possibility of a smile.

To interview Charles G. Dawes one must have all the general facts beforehand. For example: I knew he left Cincinnati shortly after graduating from law school to go to Lincoln, Nebr., to practice law. I knew that James W. Dawes, a relative of his, had been governor of the State, so I asked him why he selected Lincoln.

"Dawes was my cousin," he drawled, "and I thought Lincoln would be a good place to begin."

The development of Charles G. Dawes' initiative really began after he moved to Lincoln. After renting desk room in a Lincoln law office, he returned to Cincinnati to marry Miss Caro D. Blymyer, a young Cincinnati girl whom he met while he was a student at the law school, although he had to borrow the money to pay the railroad fare.

General Dawes inherited from his ancestors an interest in church and philanthropy, in a measure equal to his inheritance of the obligations of public service. General Dawes' aunt had married a Presbyterian missionary in Urumiah, Persia—some members of the family are still missionaries and when young Dawes reached Lincoln, his first home was with the family of a Presbyterian clergyman, Dr. Curtis, also the pastor of William Jennings Bryan. Within a short time, the new lawyer in Lincoln was a member of the law firm of Dawes, Coffroth & Cunningham.

Don Cameron owned a restaurant in Lincoln, where one could obtain an old-fashioned square meal for 25 cents. Here, in this restaurant, three sons of the Middle West, who were destined to reach positions of influence and leadership in American history, met as young men, on an equal footing. They were William J. Bryan, Charles G. Dawes, and John J. Pershing, then a lieutenant, who had just graduated from West Point, and had been detailed to Lincoln, to drill the cadets of the Nebraska State University. The friendship formed between these three men at that time, has endured throughout the strenuous military, political, and business activities of this little group of self-made men, who started in life together in the capital of Nebraska.

Dawes' first big legal case was the Nebraska rate case, where he appeared as counsel for the Lincoln Board of Trade.

"I was one of the leaders in the business movement to get a reduction in railroad rates in Nebraska," he said. "You'd better read my argument, and you can get the whole story there," he said. His argument, although presented in behalf of the citizens of Nebraska, was so fair that it was considered as a common-sense statement of a case which would justify the railroads in meeting the needs of the farmers. He maintained that a readjustment of railroad rates would benefit not only the farmers but the railroads themselves by increasing the prosperity of Nebraska through which they ran.

"I ask you to consider," he said in his argument, "the local rates with reference to the rates from outside points to the State of Nebraska, and in some way lower local rates as compared with through rates so that however small the shipments may be at first, interior Nebraska in the home markets of the State may have a fair chance as against



outside competing points." In the same argument Dawes maintained that between the rights of the innocent stockholders and the citizens of Nebraska, also innocent, "the rights of the citizens of Nebraska must prevail." And they did prevail, with the result that Charles G. Dawes won the case, not only for his clients but for the farmers of Nebraska, who have never forgotten this service performed in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, this same book goes on with this further account of General Dawes' activity at Lincoln:

He formed the Dawes Business Block Co., which purchased business property in the center of the city. At the same time he began to see opportunities in the public utility fields of Wisconsin and Illinois. In 1893, a Nation-wide panic caused a slump in prices and values in Lincoln, which was described at the time as terrific. Many of Dawes' friends and unknown followers had invested their savings with him in the real estate purchases. There were many failures in Lincoln that year, but Dawes held on. He bought back the stock of all those who wanted to sell out, dollar for dollar, so that no one lost a cent because of their business relationship with him. This was the first real test of the philosophy of life which Dawes always held, but which he expressed in an admonition to small investors later on when he counseled them to keep their hands on their pocketbooks as they traveled through life. A few years later he expressed a similar warning when he said: "Try to invest your money with successful businessmen in the business in which they have succeeded."

Mr. Speaker, I wish not only to express sorrow in the passing of General Dawes but to pay tribute to this great American whose activities have been so well described here by the others.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to join with the gentlewoman from Illinois, and the many others among my colleagues, to express my sense of loss at the death of a distinguished American, Charles Gates Dawes.

I need not recite the long record of achievements embraced in the career of one of the most colorful figures of his generation. A lawyer, an author, an industrialist, and a banker he served his country in addition as a soldier, a diplomat, and a statesman. His career of service was climaxed, but by no means concluded, with a term as Vice President of the United States. The whole world recalls the plan that won for him the Nobel Prize for Peace, recognition of his far-seeing plan which set up the reparations payable by a defeated Germany after the First World War. It is perhaps significant that no one arose on the national or world scene to perform a similarly successful service after World War II.

Charles Gates Dawes was a man dominated by devotion to high ideals, but he was also one who demanded—and gave—driving energy to the causes he served. The famed underslung pipe, and a rare capacity for expletives were characteristics deeply etched in the American scene. He used colorful language in demanding action in the national interest. "Hell n' Maria," he told a congressional investigation, "what do you suppose we went to war for? We went to war to win and we did it."

Illinois is proud of the service rendered to the Nation and the world by

Charles Gates Dawes, and in his passing mourns the loss of a giant of his generation. God graced him with long life, and Charles Gates Dawes lived it with driving energy in the service of his fellow men. He was a dynamic symbol of devotion and fidelity to every trust, private and public. His death creates a void, but his career will continue to challenge patriotic Americans to strive toward the goal he reached.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD my remarks on the occasion of the death of one of Chicago's foremost citizens and a very great American, the Honorable Charles G. Dawes, former Vice President of the United States.

To those of us who knew him, the life and works of General Dawes have a special meaning. He was one of the finest examples of what free enterprise under the American way of life can produce in the way of a gentleman, a public servant, and a fine citizen.

Throughout his long life Gen. Charles G. Dawes devoted every possible minute of his time to service to the public. He was honored by his country with such important positions as Comptroller of the Currency, first Director of the Federal Budget, Ambassador to England, and Vice President of the United States.

He served his country well in war, but when peace came he devoted all his energy to solving the problems that followed in the wake of the war.

His great services in this field were recognized by the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, which honored him with its annual award for furthering the cause of world peace, and with characteristic generosity General Dawes gave his share of the award money to the endowment of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations. He was a tireless worker and was recognized as one of the Nation's foremost business executives. He was an inspired and inspiring leader in a wide variety of civic and humanitarian projects. He leaves a great name behind. Chicago's citizens and all his fellow countrymen will long honor the memory of this great man.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recall the first time it was my pleasure and privilege to meet Charles G. Dawes. In 1909, I was an undergraduate student at Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill. While there I became a member of the Delta Upsilon fraternity of which General Dawes, who resided in that city, was an eminent alumnus. He was an occasional visitor at our chapter house and was one upon whom we could depend when in need of assistance for the betterment of the chapter.

His public services as Comptroller of the Currency, as general purchasing agent for the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, as the first Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as President of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as Vice President of the United States, and as Ambassador to Great Britain were notable for the economy and efficiency with which he per-

formed them. He had a keen insight into the future and even before his election as Vice President, foresaw impending designs upon our form of government. He organized and became the leader of a group known as the minute men of the Constitution whose objectives were to preserve our basic law from destruction. Keen, practical, well-informed, and dependable men are always needed to maintain this Republic of ours on even balance. General Dawes measured up to those standards.

Illinois mourns the loss of a distinguished son. She is grateful that his robust physique and alert mind enabled him to carry on for so many eventful years. She is proud of his accomplishments that have contributed so materially to the welfare of our Nation.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to join the gentlewoman from Illinois and others in paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Charles G. Dawes, one of the Nation's outstanding citizens, soldier, and statesman of his generation.

General Dawes in his life of service to his Government in time of peace and in time of war, to me typifies the finest in American citizenship. I wish it were possible for more of us in this Congress in reviewing his accomplishments to better emulate the things he stood for, and the type of statesmanship that motivated him in the interest of his country. From a review of his life's work as a soldier, businessman, and statesman we can draw not only inspiration, but information that will help us in the future to better chart the policies of our Nation. Our Nation and our State of Illinois have lost a great soldier, a great statesman, and a great American.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I share with all of you the deep sense of personal loss in the death of Mr. Dawes, and I should like to read into the RECORD a statement of former President Hoover concerning him. President Hoover has issued this statement:

Gen. Charles G. Dawes served the American people ably and devotedly and at great personal sacrifice over a period of 40 years. He was selected to such service at different times by seven Presidents of both parties. He and I served together in the First World War, and he remained my unfailing friend. Millions will regret his passing, and he will be remembered gratefully by the American people.

Gen. Charles G. Dawes was a noteworthy example of that type of citizen which has meant so much to the development of our American way of life. Our country has lost a stalwart champion of those principles and freedoms which have set our country apart from other nations in so many outstanding achievements.

Our loss is, indeed, the Nation's loss.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as a small boy my recollection of Charles G. Dawes was the bold face with the set chin and the underslung pipe. Here was the rugged American that just grew up with the country.

This boyish impression of Charles G. Dawes has remained with me for over 30 years and I have never forgotten the era which men like him made great. Those were the times when men met their problems each day and solved them, balanced their budgets but still found time to help their fellow men.

Even long after this great man is dead he will be pointed to in history as that fighting type of American who helped make America great. Only in recent days we have seen another of this same type appear in these Halls and possibly disappear into history. We are wondering if the mold that made these men will have to be closed forever. Such giants among men as Charles G. Dawes and Douglas MacArthur do not come every year but it is always pleasant to have had such men on the scene and to have set examples and goals for other men to reach in the progress of mankind.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the few men left in Congress who knew General Dawes personally and intimately. His passing was a great shock to me because of the high regard I had for him when he was Vice President.

A great poet has said that "an honest man is the noblest work of God." Charles G. Dawes had two qualifications that rendered him especially great. He was scrupulously honest, and he had unlimited moral courage, the courage of his convictions. He was my friend, and I can never forget his kindness to me during the years he served as Vice President.

I remember one instance when Hon. Allen Cox, our present Federal judge for north Mississippi, a nephew of Pvt. John Allen, was seeking the appointment to his present position. Mr. Allen and General Dawes were great friends. There was no Republican candidate, so I took the proposition up with General Dawes and he got him appointed.

I was in a train wreck with General Dawes one night, and if that train had been going at the usual speed, neither one of us would have survived. It was barely creeping along when it crashed through a bridge. The engine fell about 35 feet and went into water 42 feet deep. We were down in Mississippi, just after the flood of 1927, when this accident occurred.

General Dawes made a speech at Greenville, and while he was there he met a young man by the name of Percy who had known him in Europe, and to hear the conversation between those two men gave you an insight into the human side of Charles G. Dawes; a man who was approachable at all times.

It is true that he sometimes sounded dictatorial while presiding over the

United States Senate. But no man, no matter how humble, would be turned down when he went to General Dawes to approach him on a legitimate proposition.

I am not surprised that the Members from Illinois regard him so highly. We need in public life today more men of his sterling honesty, his undaunted courage, his moral convictions, and his unquestioned patriotism.

He was a real American, a true patriot.

"His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world: 'This was a man!'"

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in memory of one of America's most beloved and colorful public figures—the Honorable Charles G. Dawes.

He is especially remembered in my home State of Illinois for the important part he played as the man in charge of the McKinley-for-President campaign in 1896. His wise and brilliant leadership paved the way for that very successful campaign.

Charles Dawes, known fondly as "Hell 'n' Maria" Dawes, served his country well in many public offices, first as Comptroller of the Currency from 1898 to 1901, as first Director of the Federal Budget under President Harding, as thirtieth Vice President of the United States during the second term of President Coolidge, served abroad during World War I with the Railway Engineers and later with General Pershing's administrative staff, finally leaving the service as brigadier general. He further served his country during postwar days by helping draft the reparations agreement known as the Dawes plan. His long list of accomplishments are too numerous to mention at this time, but Who's Who gives more than a half column space to this list.

Few men have been honored with so many opportunities for such varied service to their country, and few men have served so well as Charles G. Dawes. In addition to being a statesman, Charles Dawes was talented in many other ways, as banker, soldier, musician, and author. He was an American among Americans, endowed with genuine "horse sense" and a great and abiding love for his country. Charles Dawes believed in America, lived as an American, and during the sunset of his life planned to serve in greeting a fellow-American, General MacArthur, as honorary chairman of the welcoming committee of Chicago.

We of Illinois owe a great debt of gratitude to Charles G. Dawes, and are proud that he chose to live his last days in our great State.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELINGER], whose State was the birthplace of General Dawes.

Mr. CLEVELINGER. Mr. Speaker, another great son of the Buckeye State has reached the fruition of his accomplishments in the State of Illinois, as did the former President of the United States,

General Grant. The Buckeye State will mourn the passing of Charles G. Dawes. It has often happened in Ohio's story that "the path of duty is the road to glory."

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LUCAS, be given leave of absence for 1 week, to attend to official duties in connection with the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point, of which he is a member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me for Monday next be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 377), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point or order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Anfuso	Gossett	Morrison
Bakewell	Harden	Multer
Bonner	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Heffernan	Powell
Brehm	Heller	Rains
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Rivers
Budge	Hollifield	Roosevelt
Cannon	Irving	Sabath
Celler	Javits	Sadlak
Cooley	Jonas	St. George
Coudert	Jones	Scrivner
Dawson	Hamilton C.	Sheehan
Dingell	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Dollinger	Kersten, Wis.	Spence
Dolliver	Kilburn	Sutton
Doyle	Klein	Winstead
Fine	Lucas	Wolcott
Forand	Magee	Woodruff
Gillette	Morrow	Yates
Gore	Miller, N. Y.	Yorty



The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). On this roll call 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION  
BILL, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 19 on page 6 of the bill. Are there further amendments to this section?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 6, line 3, strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$20,000," and on line 5 strike out "\$100" and insert "\$50."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this discussion picks up where we left off yesterday with regard to the policy of the administration to put in these various appropriation bills, provisos whereby extra individuals may be employed by the heads of Government bureaus for as much as \$100 per day. Of course, this applies to only one bureau, that of Bonneville Dam. Yesterday I tried to get the committee to strike this provision entirely out of the bill. We lacked two votes from securing a majority to do it. I want to call your attention to the fact that there are no qualification requirements of any kind set up in this bill. There are no qualifications indicated at all on the report on the bill with respect to who would be employed. The field is wide open. Of course, the committee will tell you that it is for the purpose of employing specialists of some kind or other. It is rather interesting, however, to note that you deemed it necessary to hire extra individuals in the Mediation Board. They are not engineers, of course, but I assume they are supposed to be experts in some other field.

In any event, this matter was pretty well discussed when a similar proposal appeared in the Labor and Federal Security bill that passed the House a few days ago. In that bill it was proposed that extra employees at \$100 per day were needed for the Mediation Board. Now you find them here in this particular section of the bill, which deals with the Bonneville Power Administration. Further on in the bill, you will find a similar provision for again in the Bureau of Indian Affairs where they

want to pay a number of them \$100 a day. Later on you will find them again being covered by a provision for \$60,000 in another bureau of this agency. This comes about by reason of, and it was reported by the gentleman from Washington yesterday, legislation which was approved by the Congress 2 years ago whereby individuals could be employed by the day or on a per diem at a rate in line with the highest amount paid in the Civil Service. It contains a provision, however, that if the Committee on Appropriations sees fit to bring in legislation, then it may do so and hike the extra payment up to \$100 a day. Now, there are no qualifications at all specified here and the employees will be outside of the Civil Service. The bureau chief can hire anybody he wants to employ for as long as he wants to employ them. Under the statute I just mentioned, if it were not for this extra proviso, they would be paid not more than an amount between \$43 and \$45 a day.

All I am asking you to do here is to pay them not over \$50 a day instead of \$100 as provided in this bill. They have given no good and sufficient reasons as to why they need to employ these extra people with no required qualifications.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana, who is quite familiar with this problem.

Mr. DEWART. I would like to give a specific example of the working of this law. I have in my district a small irrigation project that is just barely able to pay its way. The Bureau of Reclamation saw fit to send in a group of these specialists. They completely swamped their accounts. They were sent in without any request on the part of this small irrigation district and they insisted that the irrigation district pay their expenses at this per diem rate, with the result that they could not meet their accounts with the Government. They ought not to be sending these men in without a request from the district in which they are going to work.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman. I am in accord with what the gentleman says. Furthermore, you will find a similar proposal in the Bureau of Reclamation. At the proper time when we reach that section in this bill where \$40,000 is allocated for similar purpose, I shall offer a motion to strike out \$40,000 and make it \$20,000 and limit those extra employees to not more than \$50 instead of \$100 a day. I think that is fair. I believe you ought to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, out of this sum of \$40,000 requested by this department, about \$20,000 or more of it goes for the auditing of the books of the Bonneville Power Administration. This is for the purpose of hiring the finest kind of auditors to check the records and thus to provide information wanted by private utilities.

That first \$20,000 goes to see that the public utilities are given a fair and a square deal. Let us see what is to be done with the other \$20,000. This Congress is appropriating millions of dollars to try to find out how you can recover manganese from slag. I am just giving you this as one example, let us say, exhibit A.

Now the men employed in the civil service by the Government do not get the kind of money to recruit the best specialists. In the steel plants and in the other industrial plants, such as electrical manufacturers, they have the type of engineers who have been watching that work all their lives, and you cannot hire one of those men unless you pay them at least \$100 a day. That is what the Government is asking for Bonneville. If you are going to spend millions and millions of dollars erecting plants for the recovery of manganese from slag that we cannot get today from Russia, why cut down what we need to hire an engineer who has to be paid \$100 a day?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is nothing in this bill that says anything about engineers or anybody else, or anything in respect to the qualifications of the individuals you would employ. You simply say you will employ individuals at \$100 per day. You do the same thing over in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They are not out looking for manganese. You are doing the same thing in Reclamation. It is a sort of policy that you are putting over here.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is in the bill appropriating for hospitalization of veterans. This type of expenditures was probably cut there. If we do not have a little honesty in Government I do not know what we are going to do. We in Congress are not running the daily operations of this Government, we are only appropriating for it. It is the administration which is responsible. If we do not trust them a little we are not going to survive long.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I still think if you will pay them \$50 a day you are doing pretty well.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what you and I think, perhaps, but how about the fellow who has the knowledge and the information? He thinks differently, and he is the one who has the service that we need. We need his services. Perhaps you and I think \$25 is too much to pay, but he thinks differently. He is not coming down here to Washington or cut to Portland, Oreg., because it has been tried time and time again. They have tried to get them for \$50 a day, and that is why we asked to put it up to \$100. I only gave manganese as an example. There are hundreds of items now. It may be copper or lead or electricity in this crisis, but if you think it is good economy to cut it down to 5 cents a day, it is O. K. with me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say you should cut it in line with the statute passed 2 years ago.

Mr. KIRWAN. When only a few people have got that knowledge, how can



you keep it in line with several years ago? That is why they charged \$100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman knows also that this very agency is employing engineers under contract, in addition to this proposal that you have here.

Mr. KIRWAN. All right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Which is doing the thing you have just suggested; that is, trying to figure out where this manganese is located, which is separate and apart from this testimony.

Mr. KIRWAN. That man under contract might not have the information they want on something else.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then they should not employ him.

Mr. KIRWAN. Oh, then just stop everything? Is that it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I still say that \$50 a day is sufficient.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. What the gentleman says about experts is correct. In 1938 and 1939 you had to pay \$100 a day to get a well-qualified expert. It is simply throwing money away in trying to get them for \$50 a day. You get a man who does not have the proper knowledge.

Mr. KIRWAN. Such a man does not know the answers. If you want to cut it down to 75 cents a day it is O. K. with me. None of them are going to be employed in Ohio, so suit yourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] once again, and all other Members of the House, if they will be good enough to open the hearings to page 1758, they will receive a bill of particulars as to the need for these services.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] explained this matter yesterday by stating that the committee had gone into this item very carefully. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] had charge of this item in the bill. He carefully cross-examined the Department on this point. For the benefit of the House, I shall quote from a part of the hearings and the justification made by Bonneville on this item. If you will look on page 1759, they set out four basic points:

1. Selection of the most economical transmission voltage for different regions served by the Administration's system.

2. Determination of the extent of decreasing insulation levels of transmission lines and terminal equipments below that previously used.

3. Operating practices which may be used and system components which may be added to reduce the margin between the most eco-

nomical line loadings and the limitations due to transient stability of the longer lines.

4. Selection of the most effective system of communication and relaying suitable for use with power-system operation, maintenance, and protection.

All of these problems are interrelated and depend upon many variables, some of which are intangible and must be approached in the light of the extensive background and experience of nationally recognized consultants.

B. Individual, somewhat complicated problems, where the analysis and the selection of methods of solution is facilitated by discussion between staff engineers and the consultants. Examples of this type of problem would include—

1. Technical design of series capacitor installations.

2. Characteristics of circuit breakers for high-speed reclosure operation, interruption of heavy fault currents encountered on the Administration's system, and switching of low- and high-voltage shunt capacitor banks having high r.k.v.-a. capacity.

3. Design of bundle conductors for voltages in excess of 230 kilovolts.

C. Problems which are not sufficiently frequent to warrant full-time staff members but which may be approached more economically in isolated cases by the use of outside authorities in a consultant capacity. Examples of such problems are—

1. Investigation of slide areas which may result in serious damage to transmission circuits installed in these areas.

2. Evaluation of earthquake hazards at various critical points on the transmission system.

3. Study of submarine cable service, e. g., San Juan Islands.

Then, if I may repeat what I said yesterday, the Bonneville Power Administration is unique in this: That they each year have a certified public accountant, not in the Government, not someone who might have interest in their audit, to make a careful check of their books. If we have any certified public accountants on the floor, it might be well to remind the members of that profession, that Arthur Anderson Co., of Chicago, which is supposed to be one of the outstanding accounting firms in the country, makes the annual audit for the Bonneville Power Administration.

We hear Government agencies criticized because they do not make a proper audit of their books, especially if it is made by some interested Government agency. Here is a case where the Bonneville Power Administration is trying to run its business like any private business would be operated and have a certified public accounting agency make a fair and impartial audit of their books. Certainly that is a reasonable use of these funds.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then do I understand that this money is to be used to pay accountants and not to pay the engineers to which the gentleman alluded a while ago?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course not; I do not say that at all; I am merely pointing out that a little over half of the funds have been used for this purpose.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This class of funds?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman means, then, that we have to get outside accountants for \$100 a day to catch up on a Government's own bureau over there?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I ask my good friend from Kansas to be fair about this. This is a case where the Government is engaged in the business of marketing power, that deals with private and public concerns. The Government agencies are constantly being criticized for not keeping good books, for not using the sound, competent practices of private enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Here is a case where Bonneville is trying to have an honest, fair, and decent accounting job done to give the Congress of the United States a fair and impartial report of their business activities, and then we turn around and say they must not do that, they must not conduct their business as a private utility would but must do it in just the opposite way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not have in mind prohibiting their employment; what I was talking about was making the amount \$50 a day. Surely you can find competent public accountants for \$50 a day if you have to have somebody check up on your own Government. That is one agency checking against another; is it not?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I suggest to my good friend that the Bonneville Power Administration is operating a big business. Does the gentleman believe that General Electric or Westinghouse can go out and hire certified public accountants for \$50 a day and have a good audit of their books? Bear in mind that the Bonneville Power Administration receipts for the current year will be about \$35,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But you have auditors there now that you are paying \$16,000 right in that agency.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No one in the Bonneville Power Administration gets \$16,000 a year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But in the agency there are such men.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I should like to know the name of the individual who gets it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I mean in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Let us be accurate. The gentleman is constantly saying there is no justification for this item. If the Members would just



turn to the hearings they would see the justification there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to bring out the fact that this \$40,000 in addition to hiring such experts as outstanding accountants and engineers to do a particular job also is to be used for the purchase of passenger automobiles covering a four-State area, 12 of which shall be for replacement only. I think the sum is small indeed for the service rendered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How are the other administrative costs of the project paid for?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This entire agency is operating on a reimbursable basis. Every dime that we are spending on this project is paid back to the Government with interest and they are away ahead on the repayment schedule. They had a net profit last year of \$12,000,000, allowing for amortization on the investment, for interest on the investment, for depreciation and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Why are not the accountants paid for and charged to the administrative cost instead of being paid on a separate basis?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There is no authority in law for the Bonneville Power Administration to pay the certified public accountants unless we adopt the language as it is in the bill now. They have no legal authority to do it otherwise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In addition to the \$12,000,000 which was returned to the Treasury of the United States last year the gentleman should also bring out that since the inception of this act years ago a total of \$54,000,000 have been turned into the Treasury of the United States and that consisted of income derived from only two projects.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes; every dime this agency has spent will be repaid to the Government.

Let me ask the Members just one question. Here is a large enterprise that is doing a job for both public and private interests. It is selling power from an investment of about a half billion dollars. If you were operating a large private business enterprise and you were on the board of directors and you said to the manager of the enterprise: "Well, I am sorry, we cannot allow you \$100 a day to hire an engineer to do a difficult job on a transmission line," you know you would be tying the hands of the manager so that he could not do a fair, decent job for that business enterprise. Out in the Northwest we are building some of the largest transmission lines that have ever been built in this country.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I agree with the gentleman. I have had some experience in employing talent of this character and you cannot get such talent for less than \$100 a day. It is a question whether you can get them for that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I agree with the gentleman. Suppose they are building a new transmission line with a huge voltage, they have to call in expert engineers. They cannot go out and get an engineer for \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year to do that work. They go to the large electric companies for their engineers.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I add that I am for economy as much as anybody in the House, but I do not think this is good economy.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his statement, with which I heartily agree. He has put his finger right on the pulse of this problem. Is it not the fact that the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas would gnaw at efficiency and at the accuracy and reliability of figures on which the general public and the private utility companies depend when looking at the rate structures in connection with a huge project such as the Bonneville Power Administration?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is right. I think the Congress should criticize this agency if it did not hire a private accounting firm to do a job of auditing. We talk about private enterprise here morning noon and night, but when the Bonneville Power Administration wants to hire outstanding private certified public accountants, such as Arthur Anderson & Co., then the Members want to come in here and criticize that agency. The Congress should have the opportunity of getting an impartial report from a private company.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that every dime of the money involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas concerns private enterprise and legitimate, high class professional people, such as accountants and engineers?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is exactly right, and if the books are not audited properly the rates may be changed, and a lot of private utilities will be directly affected by an unfair offer.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there is nothing in the bill that says who you are going to hire or the qualifications of the individuals who would come in for the \$100 a day. This does not say who they are to be or their qualifications. There are no qualifications set up at all.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If you were on the board of directors of a corporation, would you tell the manager, "Now, you have to hire this fellow with these qualifications" and tie him in a strait-jacket?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, but I have seen the Government pay a good many thousands of dollars to individuals, not particularly because of their qualifications, but because of other reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to use so much time, but I do want to say this: It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas must proceed either on the theory that perhaps the Administrator is not going to be honest about this, or that he is going to be inefficient in some ways. If we take the attitude that he is going to try to be dishonest and use all the money regardless, or if we take the attitude that he is going to be inefficient about it, of course, that means the amendment does not go far enough. It means that they should rather make an attempt to remove the Administrator.

I think we should remember that if we assume, as perhaps this amendment does, that the Administrator is going to try to use all of the money that is given to him, then this amendment means nothing, because he has a certain amount of money there. If he does not use that amount of money for these experts, then—on the theory of this amendment that he is going to use the money anyway—he simply will then use it for other purposes. He has the power to do it.

So the Administrator has this amount of money, and he can use it to run his agency. If you say to him, "You cannot pay these experts more than a certain amount," then, going on the theory of this amendment, the Administrator is simply going to use it for other purposes, so that the money will be gone anyway.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas, Does your amendment have in mind the fact that the Administrator is going to try and use all the money that he has at his disposal? Do you believe that is what he has in mind? Or do you have in mind the fact the Administrator is going to try to administer this economically, efficiently, and honestly?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand the general rule to be that when funds are allocated to an administrator as he sees fit to use in some way or other, they usually use it up before the end of the year. With reference to the gentleman's question, I do not know how he is going to use it. There is nothing in this bill that qualifies the individual. The gentleman from Ohio said a while ago that it might be used to try to help discover manganese, or something like that. The other gentleman said they were going to use it for auditing books. Nobody knows what it is going to be used for. There is nothing in the bill that says it is going to be used for one particular purpose, but just to spend \$100 a day. Maybe I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. FURCOLO. I would like to ask this question: Do you yourself think, and is it one of the bases of your amendment, that this Administrator is going



to try to use this money efficiently and honestly and economically, or is your amendment based on the fact that perhaps he may not, and for that reason you are trying to tie his hands?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know about honesty, but I would like to have some of these men in Government look toward a little bit of economy as we go along. I should like to apply a little bit of that here.

Mr. FURCOLO. Would you be willing to say that the Administrator is going to try to use this money to the best of his ability?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I hope so.

Mr. FURCOLO. Then on that point you do not know, but you hope so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not charge him with dishonesty, no. I do not charge anybody with dishonesty. I just want to be fair.

Mr. FURCOLO. Let me ask this question: Is the gentleman aware of the fact that even if his amendment carries and these experts are limited in their fees, that the Administrator can still use all the amount of money that is in the bill and can use it for other purposes? Is that so?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, he has a big leeway. He can use this any way he wants to. If he is that kind of an administrator, of course he can use it. We understand that. He has a lot of leeway to use this money. The gentleman knows it, and I know it, too. But I should like to narrow this down a little bit.

Mr. FURCOLO. As far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned, as near as I can determine from what the gentleman has said, he agrees that if the Administrator does want to use all the money he can use it even if the gentleman's amendment carries.

Mr. REES of Kansas. He can. I just hope he will not.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have listened to the argument of my good friend from Kansas that there is no way of knowing how he is going to use this money.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know now.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman's logic is amazing, because he has offered an amendment to solve this problem by simply cutting the fee in half. Of course there is nothing in his amendment that sets any standard, yet he keeps repeating that we do not know what he is going to use it for. If the gentleman wants to correct that situation, he certainly does not solve the problem by cutting it in two.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the committee if this is not the fact, that previously there has not been a limitation on funds for these experts at this point in the bill, but under the bill brought to you by this committee today there is a

limitation to the extent of \$40,000, something we have not had before.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That helps some. We should cut it down a little.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman qualify as an expert on whether the amount should be \$20,000 or \$40,000?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think his testimony the other day substantiated that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to go back to the statute that stated in the first place that you can hire these individuals at a rate per diem compared with the highest rate you can pay under civil service, which is between \$43 and \$44 a day. So I made it an even \$50.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman think the best sort of experts, whether they be bookkeepers or engineers, should be employed in connection with these power projects?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly I do.

Mr. ROONEY. Then it is not economy to limit them.

Mr. FURCOLO. It seems to me what it all comes down to is this, that the gentleman's amendment is not going to save one penny in this bill. If this Administrator is inefficient and dishonest, it merely means he is going to use the money for other purposes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it will save you from paying that extra \$50 a day.

Mr. FURCOLO. If this Administrator is not the type of man who is going to use this money to the best advantage, then he should not be in there in the beginning.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We all agree to that.

Mr. FURCOLO. It seems to me if the amendment does not save any money, if you are going to put any faith or trust in this man you have to allow him to have the experts he wants. If you are not going to trust him for that, if you are not willing to trust him for a small amount like \$40,000, he has no business in the world being in charge of a billion-dollar operation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think that is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I point out, as the gentleman from New York already has, that this committee has put a limitation on the amount which the Administrator can expend. I want to say for the record that he will not find a more able Administrator in any agency in the Government than the present Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, Dr. Raver.

Mr. FURCOLO. The gentleman from Kansas himself, the author of the amendment, agrees that his amendment is not going to take one single penny out of the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not if you take advantage of it, but it ought to save \$20,000.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes to which I am entitled

because I do not think it is necessary to do so. We had this argument yesterday afternoon.

There is not a man in this House who can say he is more conservative than I am in a reasonable and sensible degree. However, if we ever had hearings that were adequate, full, and complete on any item of the bill, it was on this item.

Mr. Chairman, I have implicit confidence in Dr. Raver of the Bonneville Power Administration. He is a good man and he is an able man. This bill is written just like the bill we pass every year for the Corps of Army Engineers.

I say it ought to stand just as it is written, and I say that, knowing it is the best thing to do for the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take a slide-rule expert to make some of the subtractions which it is necessary to make from the salary of a Member of Congress. A Member of Congress receives \$12,500. He loses a big slice in taxes and another big slice in campaigning, as well as making contributions of many other kinds, and before he gets through his income is about \$15 a day. For that reason, since we are supposed to be experts in our field, it seems to me that \$50 a day for some of the experts—and I say that in quotation marks—on these projects ought to be satisfactory. I have in mind a situation in my district where in up-State New York there was a certain commission created. They allow those men \$100 a day. They go around New York State harassing the poor farmers and threatening to take away their lands for the purpose of building flood-control dams to protect the city of Binghamton. Meanwhile they could very easily do what other people have outlined and protect several billion dollars' worth of war plants by simply constructing flood walls along the Susquehanna River at the Triple Cities of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott. They pay those commissioners \$100 a day. Today what do we have? They are calling an indignation meeting up in the Chenango Valley where the Chenango River comes down and meets the Susquehanna and there are thousands of property owners who are going to be deprived of their properties if these flood-control dams are constructed. The dams have been ordered to be built by the so-called experts at \$100 a day.

I might say further that it has stirred up a hornet's nest in my part of the country and these proposed flood-control dams designed by the experts are the most unpopular works ever authorized by any piece of legislation which ever came out of any committee of the Congress. And they are the result of the suggestions of experts and the advice of experts.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman mean by his remarks to infer that the



service of statesmen such as Henry Clay and Daniel Webster and Edwin Arthur Hall here in the House of Representatives could be measured in dollars and cents?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Fifteen dollars a day it comes to. It comes to \$15 a day and I for one cannot go along with the proposition to pay these so-called experts \$100 a day when they come up into my district and attempt to ruin the farm lands of the people of my district.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Does \$15 a day include all the tangible and intangible deductions?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot answer that. All I know is that \$15 a day is a pretty good amount for a Member of Congress to realize after some of the necessary outlays he has to make.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. The country does not think there are any experts in the Congress.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be true, but at the same time I think there are as many experts here in our field as there are in the field where they are planning to select men for these jobs that are going to be paid \$100 a day unless we pass this Rees amendment. I would like to see the amendment pass.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It might be interesting for the gentleman to know that New York State has quite a stake in this appropriation bill. New York State manufactures a great deal of the transmission material and generators necessary for these projects. Perhaps some of the experts that they are going to hire may come from there—I do not know whether they will come from the Triple Cities area, however.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will not have any part in the selection of those experts. As far as I am concerned, I am not interested. I am against paying them \$100 a day.

Mr. FURCOLO. If the experts are needed, which is apparently the situation, you must either hire them by the day or hire them by the year, in which case you have to pay them a great deal more than if you hire them by the year. Certainly we do not want to get these men for \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year and then have them on the Federal payroll. In the long run, it is merely an attempt to keep them on a reasonable basis.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let us pass this Rees amendment and cut them down to \$50 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. I merely wish to make this observation: That the statesmanlike

services of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] are worth much more than \$100 a day to the people of the Triple Cities.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate that, as long as the gentleman from the Triple Cities can get enough votes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment may again be reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 59, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 6, line 6, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert the word "twelve."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every Member of the House feels, as I do, that under present conditions we should make cuts in Government expenditures wherever possible, insofar as those cuts will not materially affect adversely the operation of our Government.

This amendment which I have offered might appear on first thought to be a bit picayunish. It is simply the first of several amendments I shall offer to place further limitations on the use of funds by the Bonneville power project to make purchases of passenger motor vehicles.

My amendment would merely place a further limitation on the purchase of these vehicles to provide for replacements, but restrict purchases of additional ones. This amendment will cut off four automobiles. As I say, it may appear picayunish, but when you consider that these automobiles cost an average of \$2,500, that in addition we will have to pay \$2,500 a year for the chauffeur to run the automobile, and when the cost of operating the automobile for a year is considered, it amounts to about \$7,500 for each one of these automobiles. That is about what it will cost the Government per additional automobile next year.

I find in this bill six places where new automobiles are provided for over and above replacements. There are 122 new and additional automobiles provided for in this bill. If you multiply 122 by \$7,500, you will see it will cost the Government to operate these additional automobiles almost a million dollars.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Knowing of the exceptionally good work the gentleman from Mississippi did as chairman of the subcommittee investigating overstaffing in the Government departments, he might be interested in knowing that the

Hoover Commission, in making a study of some of these very same problems, found that while we had a great many automobiles in the Government that were not authorized, they had more chauffeurs on the payroll in many departments than they had automobiles for the chauffeurs to drive. Perhaps the gentleman could do something also to limit the number of chauffeurs as well as the number of automobiles.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wish we could do that. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I happened to look this subject up in the hearings. If the gentleman and the Members are interested I can inform them that in this Department now there are 4,650 automobiles.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And the committee bill would add to that number. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Bonneville Power Administration has a physical plant that was built and established at the cost of about half a billion dollars of United States taxpayers' money. It is not unreasonable in my estimation that an agency of that size should need 16 new automobiles. The gentleman from Mississippi says we should cut it down by 4; he wants to cut it down to 12. I can tell you with respect to this, as I did with respect to other items, that if you want to cut them all out it would not mean anything to me in Ohio. If you want to give them only 12 new automobiles, it will not mean anything to Ohio; but it does seem like very small business to treat a half-billion-dollar agency in this way.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The bill provides for 16 of which 12 shall be used for replacement only. My amendment just gives them the replacements and says they do not need the extra cars.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what I said; the gentleman wants to cut them by four.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it might be helpful to advise the Members of the situation with reference to automobiles for the Bonneville Power Administration. The Bureau of the Budget approved 22 new vehicles, 12 of the total to be for replacement only. The committee cut the 22 to 16 with 12 for replacement only. Now our good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] mentioned something about 5,000 automobiles in the Department of the Interior—I am sure that is what he meant; he did not mean Bonneville Power.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is what I said, the Department.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman said the Department. The



truth is that with reference to Bonneville Power Administration they have at the present time a total of 51 cars, all of the total being used—51 cars—in an area embracing Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, operating a business with a total investment of over half a billion dollars. It seems to me that is frugal management.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There are no chauffeurs in this set-up at all. They do their own driving.

Mr. KIRWAN. Does any Member of the House know of any business in America, any industry or utility, that is operating a half billion dollar business, with a request for \$68,000,000 to operate it, and they only have 51 automobiles?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not attempting to take any automobiles away from them. I am trying to leave them with the same number they had last year. Does the gentleman think by giving them 55 automobiles instead of 51 that he is going to relieve the shortage?

Mr. KIRWAN. The Budget Bureau knows what they need.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The Bonneville Power Administration has expanded tremendously in the last 2 or 3 years and the expansion will be greater as time goes on. In order to take care of new transmission lines to the new dams that are coming in—we have one huge dam coming in in Oregon, the McNary Dam, and another in Montana, Hungry Horse Dam—they are building transmission lines to those dams. A small amount of this work has to be done by force account. This work is not contracting, it is expanding by the very nature of the enterprise.

Mr. KIRWAN. If we were to cut out automobiles here in Washington where they can get streetcars or busses I would cast my vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Can the gentleman tell us how many new automobiles were given the Secretary's office?

Mr. KIRWAN. Where?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Here in Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We did not give them any.

Mr. KIRWAN. The Secretary's office has the biggest job it has ever had in the history of this Government.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Answering the gentleman's question, may I say that the Secretary's office did not get an automobile and did not ask for any.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think anyone objects to furnishing automobiles for field use where they are necessary. But the objections and the protests have been getting stronger and stronger in recent months due to the fact that every

sort of little employee in Washington has a Government automobile which could be transferred for field use. These Government automobiles here in Washington are used to get the groceries, to drive friends to social parties, all contrary to law, but nothing is being done about it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Maybe I will agree with the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thought the gentleman would.

Mr. KIRWAN. But I am arguing about four automobiles out in the field.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I suggest you transfer some of these Government cars that are being used illegally here in Washington out to the field and you will have plenty of automobiles to meet all proper needs there.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is a rather small thing to be talking about adding four automobiles, but, as the author of the amendment points out, this bill provides not only for 122 additional automobiles to be added to the 5,900 or more which they already have, but further on in the bill—this is speaking a little ahead—I call attention to another feature which to me does not make sense. Section 102, page 36, states that the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the purchase of station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

How anyone could interpret that a station wagon is not a passenger vehicle, I do not know. The fact of the matter is a station wagon today is one of the most dressed up forms of passenger transportation that we have. You will find Members of Congress driving station wagons in preference to what would ordinarily be termed passenger cars. I imagine that the committee was interpreting that a station wagon was the old form of conveyance that was used as a carry-all, a utility car, and so forth. If they want to do that, I think we could change this wording to "carry-all" or to "panel truck with seats" or use some other wording. But if we are going to permit the Department to add 122 cars and also permit them to buy without any restriction at all any number of station wagons which might be a glorified form of sedan—I think some of them are called country squire cars—it would be a mistake. The fact of the matter is, any car that is used in Government business should be identified with more than the Government license to avoid this practice of using them as pleasure cars. I have no objection to any department having all the transportation that it needs. Like the gentleman from Mississippi, I do not like to seem picayunish about a small thing such as the four automobiles being involved here, but unless we start in and cut out some of these small things we are not going to be conscious of some of the larger appropriations that we have, and we can make a start by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. The station wagons are used to haul men with their tools and equipment in the field. This is not any attempt to try to give some bureaucrat, so to speak, a fine station wagon to travel around in. This is to haul workmen and field service parties in the field. The language is in the bill because of a ruling by the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General ruled that station wagons are, in effect, passenger vehicles and they require specific authorization in a bill. That is the reason for it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to put the words "carry-all" or "panel truck" in there rather than "station wagon," because of the fact that today the station wagon has been dressed up and is a more expensive vehicle than the panel truck or the passenger car?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman may be entirely right. When we get to that point we will see what we can do about it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I hope you will.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to make it clear that it is solely for the purpose of hauling the workmen out in the field, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration and these other agencies, because they can haul a lot more men in that type of vehicle than any other type of automobile.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But the carry-all will do the job completely and will not lend itself to being used as a pleasure car.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 94, noes 41. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

##### MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$7,700,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT: On page 6, line 25, strike out "\$7,700,000" and insert "\$6,900,000."

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to reduce the sum allowed by the committee for this item in this bill from \$7,700,000 to \$6,900,000, a total cut of \$800,000.

The purposes for which the money is appropriated in this bill to the Bureau of Land Management are several. One is



the lease and disposal of lands and mineral resources, and others are land classification, grazing administration, forest management, cadastral surveys, soil and moisture conservation, Squaw Butte Experimentation Station, fire suppression, and general administration.

Each one of these items is increased in this bill over what the Bureau has been allotted for these items in the current fiscal year. As requests were presented to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department requested a total of \$8,850,000 for the Bureau of Land Management. The committee cut out \$1,000,000 for construction. They just would not allow that at all. That left \$7,850,000. Out of that the committee took \$150,000 for assorted minor items. My amendment, if adopted, would reduce the \$7,700,000 by \$800,000.

What is the situation in regard to the request and the allocation by the committee in this bill as compared to what is available for the current fiscal year? The committee allows \$7,700,000. Available for the current year is \$6,927,810. Therefore, the committee allows an increase for 1952 of \$782,190.

I have long followed the policy that we in this Congress, when we go to authorize or appropriate money, ought to eliminate entirely the unnecessary items, we ought to reduce the desirable items as low as possible, and we ought to scrutinize very carefully indeed those that are essential before we legislate and approve the projects that are submitted.

Lest it be said, and it no doubt will be said, that some of the functions of this Bureau of Land Management are self-sustaining, that they have some connection with the national defense, and I am not going to quarrel about that to any great extent, although I think it is indirect rather than direct; but lest it be said the Bureau could not sustain that kind of a cut and carry on its operations, let us look at two items in the bill we have here.

The committee bill includes \$555,000 for land classification. This means the classification of public domain lands to determine whether they are most suitable for agriculture, grazing, forestry, or some other purpose.

Also included in this item is \$765,000 for cadastral surveys. That is a survey of public-domain lands to establish township, section, and other legal land boundaries.

I contend that the total of \$1,320,000 for those two items would fall in the unnecessary or unessential category; but let us say it does not go that far and that, therefore, we do not cut it all out. Let us say it falls in the desirable classification. Therefore, it falls within the category of items we can legitimately cut from this bill, and save a reasonable sum of money. By cutting here we can do a little something toward economy in these appropriations and in this Government, and afford some modicum of relief, possibly, to the taxpayers, who are being called on to carry an ever-heavier burden from time to time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the gist of the gentleman's argument, it is simply this, that since we now owe \$260,000,000,000 and since we are going to be called upon to pay heavier taxes and even with the new tax bill it is estimated that we will be \$10,000,000,000 in the red for this year, the gentleman thinks that under these conditions, as worth while as some of this work may be, it might be postponed to another day.

Mr. PICKETT. I certainly do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Has the gentleman noticed that the committee saw fit to appropriate for soil and moisture conservation some \$304,150 above the 1951 amount which was allotted for that purpose?

Mr. PICKETT. I had noticed that.

Mr. JENSEN. We are spending the large sum of a cent or a cent and a half an acre for soil and moisture conservation on all our public lands. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that more money should be spent for soil and moisture conservation on public lands because of the very fact that we need all kinds of vegetation on these lands in order to keep the soil where it belongs and keep it from running down into the streams and being piled up behind the dams that we are building and spending hundreds of millions of dollars on. I hope the gentleman will amend his amendment and exclude soil and moisture conservation. Will you do that?

Mr. PICKETT. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa I am not ever going to quarrel with him about the essentialities of providing for necessary conservation of the natural resources of this country. But I do say that you have an item here of \$7,700,000 which, according to the facts and figures available, is 10 percent more than what they have in the current fiscal year. This amendment is not a selective one reducing any particular function of the several which the Bureau performs. I say that you can reduce all of it a little bit, if nothing else, by reduction of personnel, a better use of personnel, and a reorganization of the Bureau or by any other method that you want to. I am willing to leave it to the Bureau. But I point out here in this discussion that there are two things which are absolutely unessential and unnecessary under the stress and strain of present conditions, and they are land classification and cadastral surveys. If you took \$1,320,000 allotted to those two items out of this bill you would not be injuring an essential function of the Government. But you certainly could take the whole \$800,000 which I propose to cut by my amendment out of the two items which I have referred to, and you will not be doing any injury to

any essential function of the Government.

Let the Department be selective about it and choose how they shall effect economies.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to hear the gentleman say that he hopes, if his amendment is adopted, that no part of the savings will be taken out of the soil and moisture conservation item. Will the gentleman say that?

Mr. PICKETT. I will go this far with the gentleman, and say that I hope none of this money, if the amendment is adopted, will be taken out of the soil and moisture conservation item unless they find in that item that they are wasting some of the money which is being given to them. If they find that, and they might find it, they ought to cut out the waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, in that connection the proposal to give a more than 10-percent increase in this bill, as compared to what it was for the current year, provides for an increase of 98 employees. But they say that most of them will go to the grazing service. That is true, but it is 98 employees over what they now have. It would provide for an increase of 148 more employees than they had for the fiscal year 1950. That illustrates where your Government is growing—item by item, individual by individual, and year by year. If you do not put a stop to it somewhere you are going to have it so big that everybody will be on the Government payroll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year this item in the bill was for \$6,927,810. This year it is \$7,700,000. Why the increase? The grazing fees were raised 30 percent and this brings in \$572,000 alone. That much money comes back into the Treasury of the United States. After the grazing fees were raised it was only fair that the men who raised the cattle were entitled to more consideration. Are the people who pay these additional funds not entitled to protection? If they are, then more employees must be hired.

I want to throw this challenge out to the West. It was my privilege to be invited to a luncheon on the Senate side earlier this year. I think there were three other Members of the House invited the purpose was to discuss the noxious weed. It was pointed out that this plant came over here from Russia and that it would cost \$1,000,000,000 to kill it. It is at the present time sweeping over this country like prairie fire. One cattleman alone lost 1,200 sheep on one range. All we are spending is \$7,000,000, when they said it would take a



billion dollars to make a dent in combatting this weed. Here we are asking for only \$7,000,000. It has now reached as far east as Nebraska. It is showing up all over the country, and huge numbers of cattle and sheep have been destroyed by this weed. What have we got to stop it in this the greatest country in the world? Seven million dollars. There are 180,000,000 acres of your own land, land owned by you, and all we are spending on that acreage is one-half cent per acre for soil conservation. There is no nation in the world that would not spend 10 times that amount to prevent starvation and famine on their own land.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. With reference to the cadastral surveys mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT], I just happen to know a little about the problem which this appropriation refers to. The Oregon and California administration in the Bureau of Land Management has to manage three and one-half million acres of timberland in the State of Oregon. It is necessary, in order to make a sale of timber and to manage an area properly, to have the land surveyed. A specific problem came up last fall. A buyer of timber came to me and said he was not able to complete a deal on the necessary timber to keep his operation running because he could not get it surveyed. I took the problem up with the Oregon and California administration and was informed that they had enough requests on file then to keep their existing survey personnel busy 80 years. They thought that about 80 years after that date they might be able to go ahead and survey the land. I cannot go into the merits of the gentleman's amendment whether or not this cut can be made. All I can say in answer to his statement in regard to these cadastral surveys is that if we are going to manage this timberland acreage properly we must have the surveys.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In that same connection the gentleman's amendment will have the effect of cutting the funds for fire suppression, involving the greatest stand of timber in the country in Oregon. It does not affect the State of Washington, but the State of Oregon has a great deal at stake, in preserving this valuable stand of timber.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman. As I said, it is only \$1,000,000 more than we allowed last year, and \$500,000 of that goes for the enforcement of this Grazing Act. We had scientists from the West before our committee, and they stated it would take a billion dollars to kill the noxious weed now sweeping the country like a prairie fire. All we allowed was \$500,000 to take care of it. If you choose to let it go, it is O. K. with me. The decision and the responsibility are yours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this morning the full Committee on Appropriations reported a bill calling for additional military expenditures during the fiscal year 1951 to the huge sum of \$6,400,000,000. I think in view of the absolute necessity that faces us of finding that amount of money for the military, certainly we must do everything we possibly can toward saving here and there in things which can well be put off for a few years without any bad effects upon our country.

I think the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct when he says that such items as land classification and also cadastral survey can be slowed up on now without harm. That is the kind of work that should be done in the future when plenty of manpower is available instead of taking our personnel away from the war effort.

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be adopted. Certainly it will be if we keep in mind the serious necessity of trying to find such an enormous sum as \$6,400,000,000 for national defense which was just reported out by my committee this morning.

Worthy as many projects may be, it is our duty to evaluate the respective values. In this amendment there is no curtailment of activities affecting the lives and welfare of human beings. This sort of work should be put off to such time in the future when the need for all-out preparedness is not so necessary. Nondefense items must be thrown out of this budget.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN to the amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT: "Provided, That this amendment shall not apply to soil and moisture conservation."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat responsible, or I hope I am, for increasing the items in this bill as it affects the Department of Land Management. I have pleaded with the Bureau of Land Management and also with the Bureau of the Budget that this is one agency of the Government that has never had adequate appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I agree with the gentleman in his compliments of the Bureau of Land Management, although I intend to support this amendment. I should like to say with all due respect to the Bureau of Land Management that the subcommittee of which I was chairman last year, whose duty it was to investigate overstaffing in the Government service, had nothing but compliments for the Bureau of Land Management for the efficient manner with which they managed their personnel problems.

Mr. GRANGER. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, for that is exactly what I wanted to talk about.

The reason I feel somewhat responsible for the amendment is the fact that for the last 2 or 3 years there has always been this controversy between the users of the public domain and the committee as to the grazing fees. I was somewhat instrumental in having the grazing fees raised; and as a result of that \$500,000 has been brought into the Treasury. It would seem to me to be most unfair at this time after the Bureau itself and the users of the public domain had been willing to accept the Committee's recommendation. Now we turn around and say that because they have been willing to cooperate we are now going to cut this item in the budget.

Further than that, every item referred to by the gentleman from Texas is tremendously important, more important now due to the war effort. I have had hundreds of letters from veterans who are trying to get homesteads. Many of these lands are not even surveyed and cannot be classified. It cannot be determined whether or not they are useful for that purpose until a survey is made. I have taken an interest in that item. I have tried to get adequate personnel so that we might have the land surveyed and classified.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe the gentleman will agree that whatever fund the Bureau of Land Management does have should be allocated to the things that the gentleman has been mentioning, like surveys, where they are vitally needed and where they will do the most good. If we are going to reduce appropriations the remaining funds should be applied in the most skillful and advantageous way possible.

Mr. GRANGER. Yes. I agree with the gentleman and that is the thing which is wrong with this amendment. It makes an over-all cut of \$800,000, then it is left to the Bureau to determine where the cut is to be made. That has never proven to be a satisfactory way of reducing an expenditure to the Government; that is, allow the department to allocate it where it thinks it is needed. I assure you there would likely not be any reduction in the administration of the act. It would come from services performed.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. As I tried to indicate in my discussion of the amendment, the entire amount could come out of the \$1,320,000 allocated for land surveys and cadastral surveys. Someone objects to that and says: "We cannot cut that." Someone objects to a reduction of anything when you try to cut theirs. It could come out of those two items and do no injury to any other part of the program.

Mr. GRANGER. I have worked closely with the gentleman in connection with



these things, in fire prevention and other worthy purposes, and he is an advocate of spending money for those purposes. Now he is offering an amendment that is absolutely contrary to what he has ever done before.

Mr. PICKETT. If the gentleman will yield, I respectfully disagree with him. The gentleman does not have the time and I shall not take the time to debate that, but the gentleman's statement is not entirely accurate.

Mr. GRANGER. I want it to be accurate. I will see the gentleman and we will make it accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN to the amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT: Insert "of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation."

Mr. KIRWAN. We will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] as amended. The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees under section 3 of said act and of 25 percent of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said act, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss an action taken by the subcommittee which seems to me was inadvisable. During the debate on this bill and other appropriation bills we have repeatedly stricken out, by points of order, legislation on appropriation bills. The committee action I speak of now is not legislation in this appropriation bill. It is an indirect bit of legislation. I refer to the statement of the committee on page 5 of the report wherein it discusses the elimination of the item of \$1,000,000 for construction in the Bureau of Land Management budget, the construction being for the building of access roads in the Oregon and California area, most of which land lies in the State of Oregon. What the committee says in that paragraph is this:

While not denying the merit of such roads, the committee has rejected this estimate.

The committee was willing to provide funds for the initiation of an access road program in prior years on the assumption that the legislation relating to the distribution of receipts from the sale of timber would be modified.

Later on in the same paragraph it says:

The committee will be unwilling to provide for capital expenditures of this nature unless and until substantial adjustments are made regarding the distribution of receipts of timber sales from the Oregon and California and Coos Bay grant lands.

That would seem to me a method used by the Committee on Appropriations to compel legislative action which must come through the Committee on Public Lands. The Committee on Public Lands has had this matter under consideration for years. I was a Member of that committee for one term of Congress and I know we discussed it then. We have been trying to work out the matter of distribution of payments to the counties involved in these land grants, but for the Committee on Appropriations to come in and at this point stop the road construction program which is necessary for the removal and the harvesting of timber needed in our present mobilization effort, to eliminate that appropriation at this time merely because it does not like the existing law with reference to the Oregon and California grant, I think is not only unfair, but I think it is unwise. I think it is a mistake to get at a problem of that kind in such an indirect way. This is said without reference to how much should be included for an appropriation. I just object to this method of doing it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Would the gentleman kindly tell the House how much money from the sale of the timber owned by the United States Government, the property of the taxpayers, goes into the Treasury of the United States, and how much goes out as a gift or donation?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will try and give the gentleman the figures that he indicates. Since 1938 down to 1950 the average payment to the counties has been \$916,000 a year. May I point out to the gentleman that this land is now conservatively valued in the neighborhood of \$500,000,000. If it were on the tax rolls I think we would be collecting in the same area rather more than \$1,000,000 per year in taxes, so I do not think the present situation is too out of line.

Mr. NORRELL. The truth is though, is it not, that although this timber is owned by the Government, little, if any of the money derived from the sale goes into the Treasury of the United States, and not only do we donate the entire purchase of the timber but the Government has heretofore been constructing access roads to get it out of there, and we ought not to construct roads at enormous expense in order to give the money away to somebody else.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I must correct the gentleman. He is almost totally wrong in that statement. The land

originally was on the tax rolls of the State of Oregon. It was repossessed by the United States Government in 1916. The Government at that time paid out a total of \$5,673,000 for the land. The gentleman stated that the Government was not receiving any money. That is not true. The Government has received to date \$8,105,000 from the land, which should never actually have been back in the hands of the United States Government at all. It should have been on the tax rolls of the counties of the State of Oregon.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. First let me say to the gentleman that the committee certainly did not engage in legislating on this item.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think it actually had that effect, if I may say so.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If I may finish my statement, the statement in the committee report merely gives the reason why the funds were denied.

The committee wanted to be fair about this and tried to do the right thing. If the House is interested in economy I think it should be advised of the record in the hearings in connection with the disposition of funds from the sale of the Federal timber in this area.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The committee did an excellent job in the hearings and in the complete statement of the subject that is contained in the volume of the hearings on this bill. I think it is a very constructive piece of work.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We tried to get the facts. The House should be advised that we are in the situation where practically all of the proceeds from the sale of the timber go to the State of Oregon. Uncle Sam has the job of administering this great resource but gets hardly anything out of it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I must correct the gentleman on that, because the very book he is reading from does not bear it out.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That statement stands, and the record bears it out.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No, it cannot bear it out, because by law at the present time the counties in the State of Oregon cannot receive more than 50 percent. Then there is a 25 percent that goes into the repayment of a debt previously contracted in lieu of taxes to the State. The Federal Government receives 25 percent. Nothing can change that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Then there is another 25 percent, which brings it up to 100 percent, for administration.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman clearly does not understand this matter. The facts are as I have just given them.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We want to be fair and get all the facts. The committee went to great lengths to make a complete study.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. You have the facts correct in the hearings statement, I will say that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman will refer to page 208 of part 1 of the hearings, he will see that I asked



Mr. Clawson, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, some questions in connection with this matter. At one point in the middle of that page I said, "It has been about 15 or 16 percent of the amount, not 25 percent?"

That is referring, I believe, to the administrative expense.

Mr. CLAWSON. That is correct—I do not know the exact figure.

Mr. JACKSON. That is what we have been appropriating?

Mr. CLAWSON. That is what was appropriated I believe last year.

Mr. JACKSON. When you sell \$1,000,000 worth of timber, \$910,000 goes to the counties and \$90,000 to the Federal Government?

Mr. CLAWSON. No; \$750,000 will go to the counties, and whatever you appropriate—

Mr. JACKSON. I mean, the Government gets net how much?

Mr. CLAWSON. The net to the Government will be very low.

Mr. JACKSON. It will run about 9 percent?

Mr. CLAWSON. Yes.

We are gradually approaching a point where the State of Oregon will get the entire proceeds of the sale.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No. Let me correct the gentleman once more. The colloquy with Mr. Clawson is a statement that is technically accurate, but the law provides that 25 percent goes to the Federal Government, then you appropriate the administrative costs. You do that with the Forest Service and you do it with the Grazing Service.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I know, but the Government gets net practically nothing out of this. At the present time it is around 9 percent. As administrative costs go up and it reaches the full 25 percent, the Government will not get a dime out of it. We do not have that in connection with the Forest Service timber. It is a very unfair situation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Consider this, if the gentleman from Washington will, this land which we are now discussing represents 30 miles on each side of the Southern Pacific Railroad from the California State line to the Washington State line. It is some of the best and most valuable land in the State of Oregon.

The State of Oregon presently is 52 percent owned by the Government of the United States. It has been clearly revealed in the hearings time and time again that the State of Oregon, with this land taken right out of the heart of it, certainly is entitled to reimbursement from the proceeds from that land. That is the situation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course I think the gentleman is aware of the fact that the timber or the land which was reverted from the railroads, the title reverting to the Federal Government under the provisions of the law, has been more beneficial to the State of Oregon under this arrangement than it would have been had the railroad continued to own it because all of their back taxes have been paid.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Of course, as the gentleman knows, had the railroad continued to own the land and had it gone into private hands it would undoubtedly have been developed and been taxed and we would be receiving a million dol-

lars a year or more in taxes instead of \$900,000. And the situation in the State of Oregon would be infinitely better regardless of the statement that the Government does not get anything out of it. The situation in Oregon would be better if these lands had never been reverted in the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I say to the gentleman from Oregon I certainly want to be fair about this, too, I am trying to be absolutely impartial. Looking at the record it is quite obvious that the existing basic law must be corrected.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I agree on that point.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman agrees on that point.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I agree that with the coming into being of the final 25 percent payment which has not yet been made, the counties are now receiving only 50 percent. I feel certain there should be a modification. I find no objection to the gentleman's point of view that there should be legislation on this matter. Bills for this purpose will be introduced during this session.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is the point—how can the committee, acting in the interest of the entire country, appropriate money for the management of resources where all of the proceeds will be going to the State of Oregon and nothing to Uncle Sam? I just cannot follow that logic.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I have to remind the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that it is only the Committee on Appropriations' function to determine whether or not the funds requested for the program involved should be allowed. I do not think the Committee on Appropriations has any right in the world to set up this threat and shake their fist at the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Do you mean that the Committee on Appropriations cannot deny funds and give the reasons for it?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Oh, yes, you can. I am saying that you have. There is no question about that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We are being fair. We simply gave the reason why the funds were denied. The committee has authority to exercise its discretion in these matters.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I point out to the gentleman from Washington that he and every other Member of the House has the right to present to the Committee on Public Lands legislation on this subject and hearings will be held. I, myself, have been endeavoring to work out such a bill for the last 2 years.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the answer of the committee would be to bring about some legislation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to make one more point with reference to the values involved here. Every section of this land under discussion is surrounded on all four sides by privately owned land. The grant is in a checkerboard. The counties of the State of Oregon have to furnish all of the necessary civil administration for this property. The counties are certainly entitled to funds received from the sale of timber. I will say finally to the gentleman from Washington that legislation will be prepared and introduced, but I still do not like this method of shaking the fist at the Committee on Public Lands and the State of Oregon and saying, "You have to do something." It is going to be done. There is no question about that, but the problem is not a simple one. Some little time will be required to perfect the necessary legislation. Meanwhile the access road program which the committee has thus killed should, in the national interest, be continued. In fact the report of the committee agrees to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, while these gentlemen from the Northwest seem to be arguing about how we should spend dollars and how we can best conserve our natural resources, it occurred to me that perhaps we should give some thought to how we can conserve our manpower, the youth of our land, the fathers of future generations. They are of more importance than either our dollars or our materials. But a Truman tells them to fight; then an Acheson adopts a policy under which some die without a chance to strike back.

In the State of Michigan we have laws which define murder, manslaughter, negligent homicide, and other killings where people's lives are taken.

I was wondering if there is any moral or Federal law that would punish those who, in positions of authority, cause other people to die.

On the 26th day of June, last, the President ordered our men in Korea to oppose the aggressors. The Congress later said that the Chinese were also aggressors, and that our men must fight the Chinese. I get from the papers that MacArthur and the men who were fighting under him undertook that job and they were doing the very best they could to oppose the North Koreans and the Communists who were coming down through China, and to carry out Mr. Truman's orders. They fought; some 10,000 died. More than 10,000 are missing. Other thousands are casualties and the end is not yet.

Engaged in that job which had been given him by the President, MacArthur suggested that it might be well if we used some of those bombers and fighter planes for which the Congress has appropriated so many millions and billions of dollars, some of which were available over there.



Planes which had they been used would have minimized our losses. But Britain through its mouthpiece Acheson said "No," and our men continued to die.

If I understand correctly, what MacArthur wanted to do was what every military man who was ever charged with winning a war would insist upon doing—using the forces at his command in a manner which would be most destructive to the enemy. But again pro-British Acheson said "No." Men continued to die.

General MacArthur wanted to send our bombers and fighters across the line, perhaps over into Manchuria, destroy some of the enemy's bases, munition dumps, air fields, and communication lines. But again Britain, thinking of her trade dollars, through her spokesman said "No." Men, American men, died.

Memory tells me that in World War II in Germany one of the contributing factors, perhaps the most important, to the winning of the war was the destruction of the submarine bases and the air fields back of the German lines by our Air Force, the support given our foot soldiers by the bombing and destruction of Hitler's crack Panzer divisions, the blasting of the enemy's communication lines.

Now, what is the use of fighting a war if the implements of war at hand cannot be used? Is there any sense in ordering a general to use his troops to win a battle and then taking from him perhaps one of the most effective weapons at his command?

Because, to protect his men, aid in winning a war, General MacArthur's suggestion was counter to the wishes of a power-mad, British-loving Acheson. MacArthur was fired. Americans fighting in a Truman war are dying.

Beyond question, men died, other men will continue to die, because, as many say, the general's hands were tied. Because he was refused permission to use back of a certain line the forces at his command.

There would be just as much sense in a man trying to win a prize fight under a rule which permitted him to go up to a certain line and sock the other fellow.

To me the Acheson-Truman policy does not make sense.

If we had a Federal law like we have in Michigan, which punishes a man who recklessly causes another's death, this man Acheson, who seems to be running the war, could escape conviction if brought to trial on the charge he had by his conduct needlessly caused the death of our men who fought under MacArthur, who are fighting under Ridgway. Now I do not charge that Acheson is a Communist; I know of no evidence that he is a Communist. But I do say this, that the things that man has done and is doing, the policies he has advocated, and now advises not only have been pro-British, but the record will show, have aided the Communists. Why keep him and fire MacArthur? Acheson's policies have favored the Communists; MacArthur has fought them. Why keep Acheson?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I may have one more minute. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Is there any way under the rules that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] can explain to the gallery and the high-school classes now in the gallery how he can change the procedure so suddenly? I am afraid it is confusing to our visitors.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not changing the procedure. Students in the gallery. My remarks are addressed to the House, not to those in the gallery. The gentleman knows I cannot talk to the gallery? I do not need to do that; I can get my information to them by news letters and press releases, and I do not have to frank them out either. The situation may give amusement to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. To me the youth of our land are more important than our dollars. We wasted our dollars on the Marshall plan. Now we waste the blood of our young men on the Acheson-Marshall international plan.

I will say to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle or anybody who cares to listen that while we have been talking about the conservation of natural resources, I am talking about the conservation of the youth of the land who today are dying in a war which they are prohibited by the orders of the President—and I do not blame him because I think he is under the thumb of this man Acheson—they are prevented from winning that war in the shortest possible time with the least loss of life by the policy of an Acheson—and more about him tomorrow.

I hope that somebody on the majority side will tell me and those who are interested in our people's welfare and the security of the Republic just what it is—and I have asked this before—just what it is that the soldiers in Korea must do, which having done, the war has been won, peace has been established, and they can come home. Now, tell the people who are paying for and fighting this war. Neither Acheson, the President, nor anybody else has ever answered that question. But the war goes on and day and night our men are dying in Korea. Why not tell them what it is all about?

And why is a great, patriotic general fired while a British-loving, Communist-serving Secretary of State speaking for America directs a war?

Fire Acheson, the American people are demanding.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resources management: For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; conducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; furnishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; payment of expenses of

Indian fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C. 305), including expenses of exhibits; \$11,400,000.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], chairman of the committee, a few questions. I wish to inquire about the appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I notice that the appropriation is in one lump sum, broken down into a few major items. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct, yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. And no attempt was made in the bill or in the report to divide the sum to show what individual projects were included such as individual schools, individual reservations, individual hospitals, and the like. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I ask why the change was made to the lump-sum method in this bill rather than tying it down to the individual projects?

Mr. KIRWAN. I think it was the best judgment of the committee that we should let the man in charge of the individual bureau run Indian affairs as he saw fit. The committee was satisfied that whereas when we send millions of dollars to Europe and other places we do not tell them that they must use this money for this, that, and the other specific thing; that likewise in the matter of the Indian Bureau we should let the head of that agency use a little Americanism, use his own personal judgment as to where he spends the money. He knows something about the needs of the Indians.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to whom the chairman has just referred, has been Commissioner of Indian Affairs only since May of 1950? That is the total length of time he has been identified with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KIRWAN. But he has 5,000 people working under him—

Mr. SCHWABE. My statement is correct, is it not?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct; but he has 5,000 people working under him who have been there for years. So they know something about what it is all about. Take a child out of the second or third grade in school and put him out on an Indian reservation and let him take one look at what we have done to them. We cannot do much more to them than what we have done through the past 75 years.

Mr. SCHWABE. Or more.

Mr. KIRWAN. Or more; yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. As a matter of fact, he has, according to the hearings as shown at page 245, a total of 13,127 employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And may I ask the gentleman now if whether in an investigation made under this very bill whether or not other district offices such, for instance, as I have reference to as the district office that was formerly established and in operation for a while at Oklahoma City, Okla., which was the object of criticism and



objected to by every member of the Oklahoma delegation in both Houses of the Congress, will be reestablished under the provisions of this bill? Or can the chairman tell me?

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not know until I saw the workings next year whether they will or will not.

Mr. SCHWABE. Is it not a fact that information has already gone out that this super-duper office will likely be reestablished again? In that connection I have here a letter from a prominent attorney at Miami, Okla., who, by the way, is a Democrat, and from others, Democrats and Republicans. We try to look at this thing down there from the standpoint of the Indians and what is best for them. We found that the district office which was abolished in the Eightieth Congress at the request of all of the Members of Congress from Oklahoma was a detriment to the service rather than a benefit. The letter to which I have referred says:

We have noticed recent press releases to the effect that the Government contemplates establishing one large central Indian agency at Oklahoma City. It is our understanding that this agency will serve the entire State of Oklahoma and the present existing agencies would be abolished.

Mr. Chairman, we found out, I think conclusively, in our hearings, in which the gentleman participated, that the greatest service that could be rendered the Indians was at the lower level, the service level, not here in Washington, nor in a super-duper district office, as they call them, sometimes known as regional offices. We are afraid that it may be reestablished there and I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee considered that at all or could give us any light on the subject.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not know whether they will be able to do what the gentleman is talking about or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is about 80 years now since this superior race, that is what we call ourselves, the white race of America, took this country away from the original owners and stuck them out on reservations as they are called, mostly out on stone and rock, where there was no water. We said to them: "If you go there peacefully without any quarrel," and they entered into 400 contracts and agreements with the Indians, "we will provide a school for every 35 children and a school teacher." Eighty-five years after that we have 17,000 out of 23,000 Navajo Indians who have never put their foot in school. We have them out on a desert where there is nothing but sand. We do not provide water for them or any way to get water to them. Instead of being called Indians they should be called camels because they can go 8 days without water.

There is no hospital on the Papago Indian Reservation. There is a stretch of 90 miles out there without a hospital. There is not a Member of this House who would not jump up in horror if some concentration camp over in Europe did not have a doctor a half a dozen nurses within a very small enclosure.

You are not going to do much for them in this bill. You will appropriate to put on 500 people so the Indians will have somebody to complain to, but as for doing anything for them, you, I nor any Member of this House will not do a thing because we have not done a thing for them in 85 years and I know we are not going to start now.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I suggest that I agree with the gentleman as to his general remarks and I am sure we are all in sympathy with those remarks. We should have done more than we have. His remarks exactly agree with my views that it is a shame and a disgrace the way the Bureau of Indian Affairs has handled this situation with the tolerance of Congress. That is borne out by the report of this subcommittee, and I read from page 8 of the report on the bill now being considered:

A report by the committee's investigative staff indicated that there are deficiencies both in the organizational structure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and with respect to certain undesirable practices which apparently have not been adequately controlled. The Commissioner has indicated his desire to utilize the information developed in the investigative report and to take necessary corrective action. The committee urges him to do so, thoroughly and promptly.

Then let me quote a statement or two from the report on Indian hospitals to which the chairman has just referred.

From the investigative staff report on page 243 of the hearings I quote this language, which was read in the hearings by the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman JENSEN:

It was found that Indian hospitals are being located in some areas where there are adequate State or local facilities available. For instance, an Indian hospital is maintained near Yuma, Ariz. The average daily cost per patient exceeds \$24 per day. Staff inquiry revealed that adequate hospital facilities are available in a local hospital only 6 miles distant from the Indian hospital and that the per patient day cost is approximately \$14. Discussions with officials of this hospital revealed that BIA representatives have never discussed with them the possibility of perfecting arrangements for the treatment of Indian patients.

Then on page 44, reading from the committee's own investigative staff report:

The Bureau should delegate to the area level adequate authority to efficiently administer all phases of personnel management.

Then it goes on to say:

Complete revision of accounting procedures both at Washington headquarters and in the field is urgently needed.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, where did the gentleman say that hospital was located?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yuma, Ariz.

Mr. KIRWAN. Why did not the gentleman that turned in that report turn it in to the Kefauver committee? That is a racket.

Mr. SCHWABE. They turned it in to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. Oh, no. The gentleman asked for an investigation. But, I am not saying that I believe what that man said. If it is the truth, it does not belong to us; it belongs before the Kefauver committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, assembled here at this time in the consideration of this bill there are instances after instances that may be read from this committee report which was gotten out by the investigative staff of this subcommittee; an investigative staff that I never saw or have anything to do with. I did not know anything about the report until I found it here.

For instance, on page 248 of the printed hearings there is an excerpt which reads:

The area office—

That is one of these superduper offices, I think—

is staffed with an attorney-adviser. The area director admits he has no need for an attorney. The offices of the United States district attorney are adjacent to the BIA offices, and he can and does use this office when legal assistance is necessary.

Then the report goes on and on, and then they speak of the Navajos on page 249 where there appears this line from the staff investigative force of this Interior Subcommittee:

On the Navajo there are eight schools which are not being used at present.

Then on page 250 there is an excerpt from the report which reads as follows:

The total cost will be approximately \$6,000,000, or about \$8,500 per pupil.

That relates to the Shiprock School.

The buildings which have been completed were visited and the criticism voiced by several people that they are extravagant beyond all necessity appears fully warranted—

And so on. Mr. Chairman, the whole story is simply this:

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been a stench in the nostrils of this Government for many years. That is the reason, as the chairman points out, why the Indians have not had the service to which they were entitled and for which we have appropriated so lavishly.

There are two or three tribes, including the Osage Tribe of Oklahoma and the Klamath Tribe of Oregon, whose funds are appropriated for the operation of their own agencies and activities. Is that correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. There is nothing in this report or this bill to indicate how



much was appropriated out of their own funds?

Mr. FIRWAN. No.

I wish the gentleman would answer this question.

Mr. SCHWABE. I will try to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Will the gentleman try to have somebody on that side offer an amendment providing \$100,000,000 to be spent on the real American, the only American, that we now have stuck out on the desert, if we want to prove that we were worthy to come into this country?

I have said this before but one time when the Indian question was up and it was being said that they should have done this or should have done that, a former Representative from Oklahoma, Mr. Carter, a full-blooded Indian, said, "Yes, I said we made mistakes, but the greatest mistake we made was when we let a white man put a foot in this country." So if you on that side want to do something, offer an amendment to provide \$100,000,000, and even that will only be making a dent in what should be done.

Mr. SCHWABE. It might be done, and perhaps unanimously, if the Members of this Congress, including myself, and I think the chairman, had confidence in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The present Commissioner of Indian Affairs apparently did not know anything about any of the things he was questioned on which were expressed in the committee's report of its investigative staff.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want the RECORD to show at this point that the committee had an itemized breakdown of the budget estimates for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It was broken down into dollars and cents, into small items. Except as shown in the report otherwise, the committee has allowed the budget items. The reduction we made is to be applied optionally by the Indian Service. But I do not want the RECORD to indicate that we have allowed \$65,000,000 to be expended as the Indian Service may desire. That is not the case. That is not what my chairman has said, and it is not what the committee has done. We have allowed the budget estimates except as otherwise shown in the report. We cut the budget estimates from \$71,425,000 to an even \$65,000,000. We are permitting the Indian Service to apply those cuts where they may see proper. That is exactly what we are doing, if you adopt the recommendations of the committee.

I want to say this on behalf of the United States Government. I think we have endeavored to do a good job by the Indians since we have been trying to rehabilitate them. The taxpayers of the United States ought to have some credit for the millions and millions they have contributed to the Indians throughout this country. At least we have expended large sums of money and I believe the Indians appreciate it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does this language contain authority for the reestablish-

ment of a district office at Oklahoma City?

Mr. NORRELL. As I recall, that was discussed in the subcommittee. I am under the impression that the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs expects to try to work that out to the satisfaction of the congressional delegation of Oklahoma, if that is possible.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman brought out a point I think the House should know, that the subcommittee did reduce the Budget estimates by more than \$6,000,000. Nevertheless, the bureau of Indian Affairs has a right, if it sees fit, to take every dime of that \$6,000,000 out of the item of health, education, and welfare. I do not think the gentleman can dispute that statement. Am I correct? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. NORRELL. I will answer the question if the gentleman will let me.

The only thing that is optional with the Indian Service is to take what we cut them, to take the amount that we reduce their budget estimates, and apply that where they think it is best to apply it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just a minute.

Mr. NORRELL. I am answering the gentleman's question now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Please be specific. They may take every dime of the proposed cut out of the one item.

Mr. NORRELL. If I am going to answer the gentleman, I hope the gentleman will permit me to answer, otherwise I must decline to yield. I will answer the gentleman's question if he wants me to. The thing that they can do is to take the money that we cut them and apply it where they think it can best be applied. The committee thought the Indian Service was more capable of directing where those cuts should be made than the subcommittee was.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I merely wanted to make a brief observation in connection with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The new Commissioner, Mr. Dillon Myer, in my opinion is trying to do an honest and efficient job in straightening out many of the difficulties within the Bureau. I believe he is trying to get people in who will be willing to do a real job to emancipate many of the Indians who should be emancipated. We are spending a great deal of money, in my opinion, in certain areas where we do not need to spend the money because we are still trying to tell them what business to engage in; how to manage their own business affairs; and so forth, when they are perfectly capable of doing the job themselves. That sort of thing must come to an end if we are going to make first-class American citizens out of them and not second-class American citizens.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman from Washington answer the question to which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] did not see fit to make an exact answer? You will please notice that I am only asking a question, and not criticizing the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Is it not possible under the bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to take every dime of the proposed saving of \$6,000,000 out of the one item of health, education, and welfare services if they so see fit?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. First let me say I am sure my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, answered the question; but to repeat, I will say that under the authority given by the committee and the way the cut was made, they can apply it in any way they see fit. So that they can take it all out of health, or all out of construction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They can take it all out of health and welfare if they so see fit.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to continue my answer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry but I cannot yield further.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I just answer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No. I regret that my time is limited and that I cannot yield further.

Mr. Chairman, that is the point I am fearful of here. I have an Indian boarding school in my congressional district which takes care of about 200 Indian children from broken homes. Those children have no place in the world to go today if that particular school at Pipestone, Minn., is closed down. I certainly am not encouraged by the attitude of the Indian Bureau, which seemingly cannot see the great necessity, not only of retaining Pipestone Indian School, but also of enlarging it into a vocational school. Thus these children could learn a trade and after graduation from high school would be able to find a good job for which they were qualified. I surely do not object to the cut of \$6,000,000. I approve of it. But I cannot see the advisability of giving to any bureau the right to determine where this cut of \$6,000,000 should be applied. That is our responsibility. It is up to us to see that each division of the Indian Bureau receives a certain amount. We should not give anyone a blank check.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas. He is always good about yielding to others.

Mr. NORRELL. I know that the gentleman is sincere, and I do not mean to be insincere, but does the gentleman believe for one moment that the Indian Service under the charge and management and direction of Dillon Myer is going to place all these cuts on the sick and blind and the aged and the others that the gentleman has mentioned? Do you believe that he would do that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I hope not.

I will say to the gentleman that the work of the Indian school at Pipestone has meant so much to the children who



came there from broken homes, that I sincerely hope that Mr. Myer will see fit to enlarge the scope of that school. I am sure that he will not make such items as education and welfare assume more than a small portion of the \$6,000,000 reduction. We are dealing here with human beings.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman should at least be consistent over a period of an hour. The gentleman just supported an amendment a few minutes ago that did exactly what he is complaining about.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Oh, I think the gentleman from Minnesota is usually consistent. Just what does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] to cut the over-all expenditure with the same provision.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Oh, the gentleman is absolutely wrong. That was not the same provision. The Pickett amendment had to do with land management. We know that that cut was made at the expense of two intangible items, namely, land classification and cadastral surveys, which are not pressing at this time. But here we are talking about orphan children, even though they are Indians. Surely, the gentleman cannot place the two in the same category. I am sure that he does not, knowing him as I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not come to the well of the House very often, and when I do I usually speak extemporaneously. I realize it is a little more interesting when a Member does that, but I have some very interesting figures and facts that I would like to call to the attention of the membership, and I have prepared a statement and have taken a little time to make investigation in regard to these facts and figures. I verily believe they are true. I suggest that you check them as I want the RECORD to be correct as to them. I think some very erroneous impressions have been going around about the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

None of us is going to uphold the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or any other bureau, in any wrong doing. I am as much interested as any Member of this Congress in ferreting out any corruption or malfeasance or misfeasance or incompetency, and trying to get rid of it. But sometimes we get started talking about things and just assume that something is true and keep on until we really dig into it and then find that our first impression is wrong.

Let me give you some facts and figures:

First. The Indian Bureau is the governmental agency rendering to Indians substantially all of the manifold services which the ordinary citizen receives from Federal, State, county, and municipal agencies, and other public and private organizations.

Second. There is one Indian Service employee for about every 34 Indians. On January 1, 1951, there was a total of 12,661 full- and part-time employees paid from Federal funds, and in round numbers, 427,000 Indians, including Alaska natives.

Third. However, this apparently is not such a startling figure. Time, the weekly news magazine for April 25, 1949, reported:

A total of 6,083,000 United States residents (1 in 9.4 wage earners) work for the Government (Federal, State, local), according to the latest count.

The total United States population in 1948—Census Bureau estimates, reported in 1949 Information Please Almanac—was 146,471,000. If we divide this population by the 6,083,000 Government employees, we find that for the United States at large there was 1 public employee for every 24 citizens.

The committee itself has already cut the Indian Bureau appropriation down from about \$75,000,000 in round figures last year to \$65,000,000—a cut of about \$10,000,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think we should differentiate in the minds of the membership that there is a great difference between cutting off the Bureau and cutting off the Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly; but if we cut off the Bureau we will not only cut off but we will kill some of the Indians. They cannot live without the Bureau unless we set up something else in its stead which might take us many years to properly do. Yes, if that came about we not only would cut them off but we would kill them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. To revert to the Indian Service figures:

The 12,661 employees I have mentioned can be broken down into 9,232 full-time civil-service employees, and 3,429 part-time workers. The civil-service employees include teachers, matrons, dormitory attendants, housekeepers, bus drivers, cooks, and similar employees in the 88 boarding and 243 day schools; doctors, nurses, nurses' aides, cooks, technicians, and other hospital employees in 63 hospitals and in general health work; engineers, draftsmen, extension workers, foresters, carpenters, firemen, truck drivers, clerks, stenographers, bookkeepers, auditors, welfare workers, supervisors, reservation superintendents, and other technicians

and administrative employees. These employees perform the functions of the Government workers as described by the Time article.

The part-time employees include construction workers, truck and tractor drivers, and unskilled workers employed on new construction projects such as buildings, roads, dams, irrigation ditches, and similar specific and nonrecurring projects. These part-time employees compare to the employees of private contractors who build our public buildings, schools, roads, irrigation works, and so forth, and who would not normally be counted as citizens working for the Government. It may be noted also that most employees in these groups are Indians and that such employment is the only source of income available in many of the isolated areas where Indians live.

The ratio of full-time civil service employees to the estimated total number of Indians is 1 to 46, about half the ratio of Government employees to the general population.

The suggestion that current appropriations for the administration of Indian affairs, if used as per capita payments, would enable the Indians to live in comparative luxury, is made without any consideration of the many treaty rights of the Indians which the United States is duty-bound to fulfill. Furthermore, the services such as health, education, and welfare that are furnished to the Indians through these appropriations are similar to those furnished the general public. If they were not furnished by the Indian Service, the funds required to furnish them would have to be provided to the other agencies of the Government that would be called upon to furnish them if the Indians were to receive similar services.

The available appropriations for the Bureau for fiscal year 1951 are as follows:

Health, education, and welfare services.....	\$39,732,328
Resources management.....	10,614,576
Administration.....	3,580,000
	<hr/>
	53,926,904
Construction.....	19,137,651
Revolving loan fund and payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians.....	2,410,500
	<hr/>
	21,548,151
Total.....	<hr/>
	75,475,055

If the available funds for health, education, and welfare service and resources were paid to the approximately 427,000 Indians direct, each Indian would receive \$126.29. If all available funds including those for construction, revolving loan funds, and so forth, were distributed, each Indian would receive \$176.75. This would certainly not enable all the Indians to live in comparative luxury as claimed in the statement.

It is the current objective and policy of our Committee on Indian Affairs and the Indian Bureau apparently is going along with us, on this policy, to assist the Indians to become integrated into the social and economic life of the Nation by placing emphasis upon increasing acceptance of responsibility for self-management on the part of the Indians.



Progress is also being made toward withdrawal of Federal supervision and special services in Indian affairs by inducing State, local, and other agencies to assume responsibility for providing Indians with the same services normally accorded non-Indian citizens.

I will conclude by saying that I think the present Bureau of Indian Affairs under the leadership of Dillon Myer, and I am in close touch with him, is going to make some real strides if you will give the Indian Bureau enough money to do it with.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. As long as the Congress does not set up anything to take the place of the Bureau, we would not get anywhere by cutting down these appropriations, the result being injury to the Indians, is that correct?

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman is absolutely right and I am glad he made that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman is chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Lands?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish the gentleman would tell us exactly what has been wrong the last 10 years. The chairman has confessed here that we are neglecting the Indians, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] who is quoted as being the greatest expert on Indians in the United States, has leveled the same indictment. What are we doing that is basically wrong in not providing for the Indians?

Mr. MORRIS. What is wrong with the whole world? We are all in trouble.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is not an answer.

Mr. MORRIS. That is an answer. There is a definite improvement to be made in all of our boards and bureaus. There is definite improvement to be made in our society. The thing that has been wrong is that there has been some incompetency, no question about that, there has been probably some malfeasance, I do not know—if there is I hope it will be ferreted out and those guilty properly dealt with—and in addition to that, and this must be recognized, the Bureau is dealing with human beings and with their important and complicated problems. The Bureau is sort of like the corporal in the Army. The corporal gets complaints from his men and the officers. They get complaints from the Indians and from us. We all jump on them. I think, as a matter of fact, we have mistreated the Bureau in some respects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. The committee has pointed out that there has been negligence, almost criminal negligence, in the matter of health. There must be something basically wrong and just the general statement that the world is in trouble does not answer the question.

Mr. MORRIS. I will tell the gentleman what is wrong in this bill basically. Instead of \$65,000,000 they ought to have \$165,000,000 to really get the health and education standard of the Indians up to where it ought to be. We are not appropriating enough money for these poor Indian people, that is all there is to it.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. Does this \$65,000,000 include the \$10,000,000 we are spending on the Navajos and the Hopis?

Mr. MORRIS. It includes that portion of it which comes from the rehabilitation program, as I understand it, and the portion they ordinarily get.

Mr. REGAN. We have passed a law appropriating some \$90,000,000 for the benefit of these two tribes.

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. REGAN. The \$65,000,000 will not cut into that?

Mr. MORRIS. This is what happens in regard to that: Under the cut that the House Appropriations Committee made on the Indian Bureau, it will affect the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program as follows: The original request for the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program as submitted by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget was \$6,784,000. Under the cut as made by the Appropriations Committee of \$2,262,500 there is left a net authorization of \$4,521,500 for the Navajo-Hopi long-range program. This is as the bill now stands.

Mr. REGAN. What is the source of the information in reference to the 6,000,000 Government employees? I heard we only had 2,200,000.

Mr. MORRIS. The source of it, as I said, was Time magazine. To bring it up to date I called the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress yesterday to bring the figures up to date and here is the information I received:

Total Federal, State, and local employees as of October 1, 1950, 6,423,000.

Census, United States and Territories, 1950, 153,693,000; making a ratio of one to 23.93, or one to a little less than 24.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the third day that we have been discussing this bill and it is now after 3 o'clock. There is no amendment pending. I wonder if it would be in order for me to suggest that the Clerk again read. I do not want to cut anybody off, Mr. Chairman, but it looks as if we ought to get through with the bill today if we can.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. NORRELL. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply sympathetic with the gentleman from Arkansas, and I can understand why he desires to limit debate. All afternoon I have been sitting here listening to this debate. I have heard the comments of the chairman as well as the members of the subcommittee and those not on the subcommittee raising particular need with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the manner in which it is being conducted. Well, I asked the question of one of my colleagues here as to who the Administrator of this Bureau was and I was informed that it was a gentleman by the name of Dillon Myer. And, I said, I can now understand why you are having difficulty with the administration of that Bureau; why you are dissatisfied. Is he not the same gentleman who handled the Japanese detention camps, and did not the military police testify that they had more trouble with him than they had with all the Japanese combined? Is not this the same Dillon Myer who bungled the housing business? Is he not the same gentleman who was in charge of this inter-American relations program and made a mess of that?

I am not suggesting corruption or graft. However, I am not only suggesting but I am charging gross incompetence and mismanagement of this Bureau. His past performance is a guarantee of inefficiency here. But, what do you expect when Mr. Big on Pennsylvania Avenue, refuses to turn his back on people like the gentleman in charge? You can understand why governmental departments are in difficulty not only in domestic affairs, but in world affairs as well, when the gentleman in charge of the whole works refuses to turn his back on people who are doing the kind of a job that this gentleman has done uniformly on every job that he has had anything to do with. The Indians have hired lawyers to fight their cases, and he is giving them as stiff a battle as he can. As long as you have incompetence sitting on the throne you will have what all these Members complain of. I have not heard but one good word spoken for the gentleman running this show and that came from my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it would be helpful to the House if the gentleman would give the House a bill of particulars as to what this individual, Mr. Myer, has been doing that is so wrong.

Mr. BENDER. I wonder where the gentleman has been for the last 3 hours. Has he not heard the complaints that have been made from all quarters?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course, we have not had this item under consideration for 3 hours. If you look at page 6 of the report, I am amazed to find the gentleman raising the question about Indian lawyers. There is



some very interesting bit of information called to our attention where the Commissioner has moved in against certain attorneys that are trying to charge the Indians fees for rendering no service.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know anything about the kind of lawyer referred to. Any lawyer that charges a fee and does not render a service is not rendering a service; I am not for a shyster. I am not defending lawyers of that kind, but somebody should defend the Indians against the management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Will anyone here say that the job is being done well, with the exception of the gentleman from Oklahoma? He is the only person who has defended the man in charge of this Bureau.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. No, I will not yield.

This man is just not the right man for the job.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to these general allegations for some time. It is rather interesting that, in charging the present Commissioner with misconduct, Members of the House are not fair enough to render a bill of particulars and say wherein he has been engaged in misconduct. That is the only fair thing to do.

I was rather amazed to find that they are criticizing the Commissioner for taking action against certain attorneys who are not properly protecting the rights of the Indians. If you will refer to page 6 of the report, you will see that the committee has commended the Commissioner for going after some unscrupulous attorneys.

I know that in the past there have been some things in the Bureau that were not right, and they probably may still be going on. We want to ferret them out. I know the present Commissioner is doing a sincere job in trying to eliminate those activities that are not in the best interests of the Indians and not in the best interests of the Government.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I think the gentleman is making an extraordinarily fine statement. I will say to the distinguished gentleman and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] who just left the floor that if he has any evidence of any kind whatsoever, we want him to bring it down to our committee, and we will be happy to make an investigation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think that is a fair request.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I want to commend the Commissioner on his stand in taking the position he has in respect to the attorneys. It is a tragedy and it is a disgrace how the Indians are stolen blind by these attorneys. I want to commend the Commissioner for that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to ask the gentleman from California, who just spoke, through the kindness of the gentleman from Washington, if the Commissioner just referred to by the gentleman from California is the same man referred to 5 minutes ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. While I knew the gentleman from Ohio was not a lawyer, I did not know he was an Indian expert.

Mr. BENDER. I am not an Indian expert, but I can read and write English.

Mr. ROONEY. I concede that.

Mr. BENDER. And I can even understand you, my friend.

Mr. ROONEY. I will gladly concede that, too.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Since you have asked for expert testimony, I refer the House and members of this committee to Mr. WHITTEN, a leading member of the Democratic Party, and he will give you all the information you want about the gentleman I have been discussing and further, since the gentleman from Washington asked for a bill of particulars, here is your committee report pointing in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of page 8, that the report of the committee's investigating staff indicated that there are deficiencies in the organizational structure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Well, who does that mean? What does the committee mean when they say that?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman had listened to my statement a moment when I pointed out that there are certain things still in existence which had not been corrected yet. We have a new Commissioner. He has just started to take over. He is trying to do a good job so that any existing abuses can be eliminated.

Mr. BENDER. That was over a year ago that he took over.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No, he did not. The gentleman of course gets up and makes a general statement. He figures this is the chance to say something that will sound bad, so he is jumping on the Commissioner. He may not have liked what the Commissioner has done in the past in certain Government agencies, but that does not prove that what he is doing now is not right.

Mr. BENDER. It is very indicative. It is very indicative of what you might expect and what you will be getting.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman will look in the record he will find the committee commended the Commissioner for the fine job he is doing in connection with this problem of the Indian attorneys. It is very easy to get up and make general allegations without trying to substantiate them.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman from Washington respect a man like Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Certainly I respect Mr. WHITTEN, and he is not making any allegations against Commissioner Myer with reference to his work in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to give the gentleman a testimonial from Mr. WHITTEN.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio has the evidence, of course he would present it to the House. The only fair thing to do when you get up and make an allegation against a man in public office is to be fair enough to give the information to the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My experience has been that where there are certain unscrupulous persons who are against the head of an agency, in their operations they usually go to someone to try and knock down the head of the agency by general, vague statements. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio is not that type of an individual, in the case of the unscrupulous lawyers, that the Commissioner has sought to get rid of.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I wonder if that is why this committee made this report in the manner in which they did, and why we have had so many testimonials here as to the inefficiency and incompetency of the present Director?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have yet to listen to a charge giving specific information against Commissioner Myer in the handling of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to point this out, that during all the time that Dillon Myer was the head of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as was his right and duty, investigated him most thoroughly and sought on this floor at various times to discredit Dillon Myer and the appropriations for the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. But the gentleman from New York has not been



successful and I have never seen any direct proof here on the floor of the House or in the Committee of the Whole which would reflect in the slightest upon the integrity of Commissioner Dillon Myer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not come to the well of this House for the purpose of incrimination or personalities, or in an effort to place blame upon anyone except ourselves.

In 1934, some time before I came into the House, a bill was pushed through at the end of the session, known as the Wheeler-Howard Act. Under that bill a large part of the Indian population of this country was pushed back onto the reservations under what proved to be a clearly socialist method of life. A great many of the tribes had the wisdom not to sign it, but others, unfortunately, were talked into it and have regretted it ever since.

I think that all of us, if we are honest with ourselves, must recognize the fact our native Indians have been treated shockingly by the Congress of the United States from the beginning. We have treaties with them, and in some instances we have walked roughshod over these. I sat up there in the gallery for 10 years before I became a Member of this House, and I have seen claims come up in this Congress. Consistently those claims have taken from the Indians and given to the white man. When some of his good land was taken from him, he was compensated with rocks, shale, and poor soil.

I had occasion as a member of the National Organization for Public Health Nursing to share in a study that was made at the request of the Public Health Division of the Government, of the health of the Indians. There were two copies of that report. I read one of them, which naturally belonged to the organization which made it. The other report was in the Public Health Division, and we were implored to keep it quiet, so shocking was it. Unfortunately, we agreed to do that. We were a little, tiny organization unversed in political methods and believing that the Government would take hold and improve the conditions. We knew our business. We knew health, and we learned to know the misuse of various health promises—the camouflage, and all the rest of it.

In the Navajo country, what did the Bureau do? Did they meet the need? Which was for fertilization of the soil, for teaching the Navajo new methods of breeding better horses. Their wealth was in horses, and they got poorer every year. But what did the Bureau do? They built a capitol building for some \$8,000,000. The excuse was that this would give jobs to the Navajos—the Navajos, who ranged the plains. They put them inside a building doing all sorts of menial jobs. As it happened, I was down there and had a very vivid reaction myself as to what was going on and what was being done to our Indians.

I served on the Indian Affairs Committee the first year I was in this House, and I know a great deal about what went on. I know something of what was permitted in the matter of peyote. That could have been handled. I know much that I have never said because I have been hoping that the Congress of the United States would take the matter in hand and see to it that we did the honorable, decent, and constructive thing for a great and dignified people whom we had dispossessed when we came in here.

I think all of us would do well to do what has been done once in a while by a small group of people really interested in the well-being of the Indians; namely, learn first-hand something about the whole situation. I do not care whether this attorney or that attorney is rotten. I am not interested in that. I am interested in the Indians whom we have dispossessed, whom we have cheated, from whom we have stolen, though we do not call it by that term. I am interested in seeing the Congress of the United States finally do justice to the Indian.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to pay tribute to and congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for the finest, most intelligent, and constructive talk I think that was ever given in this House on the American Indian and about the American Indian.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but when they come in here and are going to shoot all the lawyers. I have to object, because I have been a kind of innocent and inoffensive lawyer for a long time, and I have no particular desire to be shot. If you would only go half way, though, I would not object—very much. You had better not shoot all the lawyers, because some of the rest of you may need a lawyer if you are going to stay here in Congress.

I venture to say I know something about this Indian question, for I was raised with them and have lived with them for 70 years—the wildest Indians on the American Continent. The purpose of the Bureau, as I understand now, is to civilize the Indian and make him a part of the general population. We have discovered that you can get rid of the Indian Bureau, if that is what you object to, just as fast as you prepare these Indians to sustain themselves. We have tried that out in North Dakota. This Congress, fortunately, has appropriated money to allow these Indians to restock their land with cattle. Out of 64 examples of that kind, of the Government giving the Indians cattle superintended by the Indians themselves, there have only been two failures and no losses on those failures, because the Indian inspectors saw the Indians would not take care of their cattle and took the cattle away from them before there was any loss. That is a great investment for the

Government and a better investment for the Indian, because I know a lot of Indians out there who have some self-respect now; they do not owe anything; they own their herd of cattle, and they are sending their children to school just like the rest of the people, and they are honorable citizens. If that is the way it can be done, this Congress ought to remember that what will apply to one tribe might apply to another.

In another county in North Dakota we decided to try the matter of the administration of justice and keep the Federal Government out. An act was passed in Congress giving that county jurisdiction, criminal and civil, over the Indians if accepted by the county. One county accepted it, and they have got along in the administration of justice all right. But you see the unfairness of it, because over half of that reservation is not taxed; the Government still owns that land in fee for the Indians; it is not taxed. Hence, in that county the rest of the taxpayers are paying the expense of the administration of justice over all of the county. If this Congress in its wisdom in cases like that would provide that wherever there is a large holding of Indian lands in many counties like in my State where some of the counties are probably 20 percent Indian lands untaxed, if those counties would be allowed, in lieu of these taxes, compensation from the Government, you would have no more problem about the administration of justice, school administration, or any other administration that the State or the National Government affords the people of North Dakota in general.

You can work this out, and the reason why some of you are mad at the Indian Commissioner is because of the system. At one time I was mad at an Indian Commissioner years ago, wanted to get rid of him; and they got another one, and he was worse than the first one. Now, then, get rid of this one and you will have another who is worse. It is the system you are driving at, not the man. It is the responsibility of this Congress. Who is it that keeps this system in operation today? It is the Congress. You do not give the Indians a chance to get out from under it. The only thing they have is the present system.

I do not know who is responsible for all of the scalawagging that has been handed the Indians in the last 150 years, but I do know it was not the lawyers of North Dakota who did it. I do know that the Turtle Mountain Indians in my State owned one-fourth of North Dakota and they owned it since 1783, but the Congress maneuvered this land away from them by purported treaties, allowing them 10 cents per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.



Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Missouri. I was about to say something about him, but I shall not do so now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the Members of the House would be interested in having the gentleman, who has the greatest knowledge of Indians and the history of the Indians of any man in America and who can speak the Indian sign language, take about a minute to explain the Indian sign language. Maybe we could go out among these Indians, and they would appreciate us a little bit more. I know when the gentleman goes out among the Indians they have a great time, and he helps the Indians a lot. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the name the Indians baptized him? Or did they baptize the gentleman?

Mr. BURDICK. No.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the gentleman's Indian name?

Mr. BURDICK. The Indians have always had too much respect for me to make me a chief of their tribe. They only do that with the sucker who gives them some money.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to have the gentleman give us the philosophy of an Indian. The gentleman knows exactly how the Indians feel about the Government of the United States.

Mr. BURDICK. I could give an illustration.

Mr. ROONEY. Before the gentleman does so, will he explain the sign language that he conveyed just a few moments ago to the gentleman from Iowa? Was the gesture not what is commonly known as the hook?

Mr. BURDICK. Of course, everybody can understand the sign language. It is not difficult to understand, because everything is natural, even some of the most difficult signs. You are in a store and make a dicker for merchandise. Do you want it? The answer is, bring it over. If you do not want it, it is the other way around. You would be surprised to know that all of you can learn the sign language in 3 days.

Where was I when I got off the track? What was I talking about?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman was talking about Indian ownership of land in his State.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to tell you about the Indians and the Indian Bureau. I asked an Indian at a meeting one time to tell me his view of the Indian Bureau. He says, "I will tell you what it is." He was talking the Sioux language.

He says, "I can demonstrate it to you. Another Indian and myself were traveling along the road one day and I saw a coconut fall off a wagon. I said, 'What is that?' The other Indian picked it up. I said, 'Give it to me. I saw it first.' 'No,' he says, 'I got it first.'"

"So we, the two Indians, began fighting and a white man came along. He said to the Indians: 'You should not fight.

Let me settle it for you. If I decide it will you accept it?'"

"We said, 'Yes.'"

They would rather do that than to have a fight.

So he said, "The white man took the coconut, bored a hole in it first, drank the milk out of it; then he cut the coconut in two and took the meat out, and gave one Indian half of the shell and the other one the other half of the shell. Now, he says, 'I have settled that for you.'"

The Indian told me, "That is the way the Indian Bureau does. They get all the meat and all the milk and we get the shell."

That is the Indians' view.

In the Turtle Mountain region that I was talking about when you interfered with me, they owned one-quarter of the State of North Dakota, and by successive treaties, which were never agreed to by the Indians, they have got 9,000 Indians now backed up on two of the poorest townships of land in the State of North Dakota. Just think of 9,000 Indians on two townships of stony land when they once owned the whole territory. The Government claims they bought it for 10 cents an acre, but the Indians never signed the treaty at all, and that case is now pending before the Court of Claims. I just want to show you that there are some Indians ready for self-government, and some are not. There are some Indians ready to be released, and I think the Sioux Indians of my State are ready because they have demonstrated that they can be self-supporting. Many of them have held offices. We have had sheriffs and other county officials who were Indians. If this Congress wants to help the Indians, make them appropriations so they can help themselves.

If you cut this appropriation you are not getting rid of the Indian Bureau but that cut will fall to the loss of some important service necessary for their becoming independent and successful citizens. It would be a severe blow if the cutting of this appropriation would in any way interfere with the educational and health programs. Education is the answer to the whole Indian question. That includes manual training and preparation for individual freedom. There is nothing that is more dignified in this world than the ownership of property and the sense of responsibility as a citizen. The Indians of the United States have made a great contribution to our frequent war efforts, and if we can send them forth to war we ought to be willing to send them forth as able, dignified citizens and permit them to take their place among the diversity of nationalities making up this great Republic of freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from North Dakota and other remarks that have been made here, particularly by the

gentlewoman from Ohio. I do not pose as an expert on Indian affairs. However, in early 1945 I was asked by a magazine for which I worked to make a survey of the Indian reservations with a view of a rather complete report and a series of articles on the subject of the American Indian. I traveled over 5,000 miles and visited most of the Indian reservations of the Middle West and the West.

I came to the conclusion that it was time to set the American Indian free. Regardless of all that may come from this discussion, it seems to me that the gentleman from North Dakota in his closing remarks touched upon the thing that Congress should address itself to from now on, and that is to provide ways and means for turning the American Indians loose, for getting them off their reservations, and out from under Federal jurisdiction.

I recently asked the Indian Bureau for some statistics. Back in 1945 I asked the Indian Bureau how many Indians we had in this country and I was informed that there were 260,000. Recently I asked the Bureau how many Indians we now have, and I was informed that there were 393,622. Obviously, then, the number has increased greatly in 6 years.

You will recall perhaps that back in 1925 the Congress of the United States passed an act which declared that the Indian should have full citizenship. It was contemplated at that time and the promise made to the American people that the efforts of our Government would be turned toward bringing the Indians into full American life, along with full citizenship. The record that has been written not simply by the Indian Bureau but by Congress has been one of failure to accomplish that purpose.

In 1933 a movement was started under Commissioner Collier to return the Indians to the reservations. That is virtually what the Wheeler-Howard Act mentioned by the gentlewoman from Ohio meant to do. From that time on our expenditures have increased year by year. In 1925 we had 4,700 employees in the Indian Bureau. In 1932 we had 8,000. In 1945 the number had grown to 12,000. In 1951 it is a little more than 13,000.

The expenditures have increased accordingly. In 1945, when I made this study, we were spending approximately \$31,000,000 a year for the Indians. Now we are asking more than double that amount. Yet we were promised in 1945, when this study was made, that progressively the Indian Bureau would work toward liberating the Indians and setting them free.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the primary task over and beyond the appropriation of money is to work progressively toward, as the gentleman from North Dakota indicated, settling the claims, getting the Indians who are capable of managing their own affairs out from under the restrictions of the Federal Government, and then letting these services that are now being handled by the Bureau be handled by the States and the agencies of local government.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have taken quite an interest in Indian affairs over a period of time. I have a few Indians in my district. I served as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I agree with what the gentleman has said.

He may be interested in knowing that I have talked to the new Commissioner, Mr. Myer, and I believe it is safe to say that what the gentleman has said is pretty much in accordance with his views on trying to emancipate the Indians that are ready for emancipation. We have thousands of Indians in the United States that can be released to operate their own affairs. It has been a struggle all down through the years even to get the Bureau to permit the Indian children to go to the local public schools. Instead, they wanted to set up their own schools. However, the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in my humble opinion, is trying to do his very, very best to bring about the objectives the gentleman has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I greatly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I am wondering if those of us who want to go along with whatever appropriation is needed, despite the fact that it seems that every year it increases, can have some assurance that the leadership in this House will move to do this job? Will they provide the legislation that will be necessary to start in motion the gradual liquidation of this Bureau of Indian Affairs and turn the affairs of the Indians over to them as rapidly as they can manage them?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. On page 5 of the committee report reference is made to that situation:

Although recognizing the necessity to provide material assistance, the committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of Indians into the general population. Unless this is done the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status and will never be able to fully enjoy the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship.

About 4 years ago I cosponsored with Senator O'MAHONEY a bill providing for the settlement of Indian claims. I believe that measure is a long step forward in getting the Indian away from the reservation. The big problem in settling this whole question is the fact that you have within the Bureau of Indian Affairs a certain group of shall we say professionals, who have stayed on all during the years and who do not want to see the Indians leave because they are trying to hold onto their jobs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is the basic difficulty.

Let me say that in all sincerity I have discussed this matter time and time

again with Commissioner Myer. It is his desire to see to it that the key people within the Bureau of Indian Affairs are people who are dedicated to the philosophy of making the Indians first-class citizens, to be assimilated into the local communities, and avoiding wardship where there is absolutely no need for it. There are a number of Indians in the United States, unfortunately, that are not eligible for release at this time. We have thousands of them in New Mexico and Arizona, as the gentleman knows, that cannot read and write the English language.

That is a sad commentary on our civilization.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is a great authority on the Indians and has made quite a study of their problems.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not an authority, but I have tried to understand their problems.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that wherever you find good soil you do not find any Indian problem?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Good soil certainly helps to solve the problem, because they can make a living as a result.

Mr. JENSEN. Every place where we have good soil for the Indians we have no Indian problem whatever. Here we let the soil on the reservations go to pot year in and year out and spend very little money to build up the soil and the problem is becoming worse and worse each year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is true.

Mr. JENSEN. I contend, and I can prove it, that wherever we have poor soil in any Indian reservation we have a terrible Indian problem.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. There must be some Indians who still want just to be Indians the way they always have and live according to their own customs and laws. Do you propose by your method to force them compulsorily to Americanize or will you then have the community swallow those people, too? Is there any room for them?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that certainly those Indians who want to retain their ancient culture and ways of life should be permitted to do so, but they can do that without the supervision of a Federal bureau.

Mr. FULTON. On the changing over to State and local control would you have any protection so that those State and local authorities might not be trying to take over very valuable rights, either in land or leases?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Certainly those protections should be accorded the Indians so long as they are needed.

Mr. FULTON. And the protection of their titles?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Certainly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We have this problem, and I think the solution must lie in the Congress, and I ask it as a question of the gentleman, even where there is good land, as the gentleman from Iowa said, in the emancipation of the Indians progress has been very difficult in the Bureau of Indian Affairs to release the Indian completely. They still feel they must always hold some sort of trusteeship and that the Indian is not quite ready yet for freedom. I think the gentleman will agree with me in that case Congress must act.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, in Alaska there are many Indians, many Eskimos and some Aleuts. That accounts for my being in almost daily contact with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I think I know something of the way they operate there. My experience with Dillon Myer has been limited to the time since he took office as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in May of last year. On the basis of that experience I want to say I consider him to be an outstanding public servant. Mr. Myer is being quite strongly criticized here today. I think a great deal of the criticism stems from the fact that he is trying to cut out some of the underbrush which has impeded the bureau which he heads, over a long period of time. More particularly I want to suggest that some of the attorney groups are most concerned with Mr. Myer's administration. As has been suggested in the report made by the subcommittee on page 6, the subcommittee commends the Commissioner for looking into this situation. I believe the fact he is doing so, in harmony with the belief of the subcommittee that something should be done, is the reason why he is under attack right now. It was indicated a while ago that the Commissioner had not done anything to follow out the report of the House Appropriations' investigating committee.

In that connection I call attention to page 243 of the hearings where it was demonstrated that Mr. Myer had not, until the time of the hearing itself, been informed of the report. The debate shows that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] asked this question:

Mr. JENSEN. How long have you been Commissioner?

Mr. MYER. Since the 8th of May 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. Approximately 10½ months?

Mr. MYER. About 10 months; a little over.

Mr. JENSEN. You say that you have not read this report?

Mr. MYER. I have not had an opportunity to see it.

Mr. JENSEN. Has any member of your staff?

Mr. MYER. It has not been provided to us.

Mr. JENSEN. No one has seen it?

Mr. MYER. No one has had a chance to see the report.

Mr. FURCOLO. I think the record should show that the committee has not given them a copy of the report.

I believe the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was eternally right when he said it was the fault of the



system, not of any Commissioner; that no Commissioner regardless of his capabilities, could on his own motion change that system.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am happy to hear the gentleman's observation regarding Mr. Myer. One may differ with Dillon Myer but he is the kind of man, if I am a correct judge, who would quickly respond to any mandate of this Congress, and would try to carry out our policy. Whatever our differences with him, it seems to me he is a man of complete integrity. I knew him before I was elected to Congress. He is the kind of man who enjoys working with and for disadvantaged people. I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Alaska express himself as he has with reference Mr. Myer's honor and capacity for public service.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to have the gentleman from Arkansas say that. I think Mr. Myer has done a first-class job in the Bureau of Indian Affairs; but, as was indicated by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], unless the Congress itself changes the system, any Commissioner is bound to follow the laws laid down by the Congress, and he can do nothing more. If the Indians are not getting a fair deal, if a different philosophy should guide our relations with the Indians, then it is up to the Congress to spell that out in a legislative manner. Until that time comes any Commissioner must proceed according to the legislation which he has before him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction: For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, \$12,000,000, of which not to exceed \$3,125,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the discussion today with a great amount of interest. For several years, while a member of the State Legislature in California, delegations of Indians have come by way of Sacramento, traveling back to Washington to endeavor to secure the rights and privileges for their own people. I am highly

satisfied with the discussion I have heard here by members of the committee. I feel they are interested, but I will subscribe to the fact that the system must be wrong, because I do not believe you are accomplishing the things which you pretend to do.

In 1949 I introduced a bill authorizing the construction of a school for the Hopi Indian Reservation in California. It passed and was signed by the President. Moneys were provided in the budget for the construction of those facilities. When the freeze came on it was stricken out. The Indian Bureau has registered its approval of this school facility, but I find that this year it has again been eliminated.

I have traveled throughout the Indian reservations in my State, and the greatest thing that the Indians demand out there is that their children be given half a chance, along with American children, for an education. We are not giving them a proper break. In the State of California we have assumed the responsibility for the education of the Indians, but on these reservations they cannot construct a school building, it is a Federal charge.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] if it is not a fact that failure of the Federal Government to meet its obligation to its wards, namely the Indians, has placed that obligation upon the taxpayers of the State of California and placed it there improperly? That is what the gentleman is objecting to, is it not?

Mr. SCUDDER. I am not objecting to that; it is perfectly all right for the State of California to assume this obligation, but in the Hoopa Indian Reservation there is not enough taxable property to raise above \$1,000 a year.

The Federal Government owes the Indians school facilities. It is an obligation. There are 3,900 Indians on the reservation. Last year the auditorium was destroyed by fire. They have an old shack that has been there for the last 70 years in which the children go to school, some of the finest youngsters you could find anywhere, and we are not giving them a proper chance.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The fact that there is not any tangible value in the reservation makes it impossible for any local school agency to raise the necessary funds to build the necessary school facilities to give the children proper education.

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman is right, and there is no way in which the State of California can provide any of their public moneys to be spent for buildings on Federal lands. Again, we have been excluded from having proper facilities for those children. I think it is disgraceful.

I talked to a chief on a reservation, who lives a short distance from Hoopa, and he said to me: "We do not want any money, if we can be assured that our children will be properly educated and

given a chance. We have had our day; we are interested only in the children coming on." I believe that this Congress is responsible for the education of these youngsters, and while we are appropriating money to be sent all over the world I think we should consider somewhat those people to whom we do owe a responsibility. I am very happy that the group of men serving on this Committee on Indian Affairs seem to take a sympathetic interest. But something is stopping you. Possibly it is the system, but for goodness sake, let us try to correct this injustice.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, now that everybody has spoken kindly and very highly of the Indians—and I believe there is no one who has spoken who did not speak kindly of them—I ask that the Clerk be allowed to read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 270 passenger motor vehicles, of which 191 shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 12, line 7, strike out "227" and insert "191."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of asking the Committee's time uselessly. I think this amendment is so simple that it does not require much explanation. It is the second of a series of amendments which I have prepared, intended to cut out the expenditure of public funds for additional automobiles for the various agencies in the Interior Department.

I attempted to find in the committee hearings some justification for the increased number of automobiles requested by the various bureaus and agencies in the Department of the Interior. After going through 1800 pages of the hearings and testimony I found one reference to automobiles, and that on page 1800. The sole justification I can find for these additional automobiles which these agencies are asking for is the fact they want them, and the Bureau of the Budget recommended that they be allowed. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, according to the table on page 1800, already has 1627 automobiles. We are providing in this legislation for the replacement of 199 of



the 1,627 automobiles; and, in addition, the committee bill would give them 36 more. The amendment which I have offered, and which I think is very reasonable, merely cuts off the 36 additional automobiles but permits for the replacing of 191 of these old ones.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Bureau asked for 287 automobiles. We cut that to 227. In other words, we cut out 60 automobiles. If we cut them down to 80 someone probably would offer an amendment to cut more out. But we have cut out 60 already.

Now, on these Indian reservations where there is a great deal of sand and no highways, the tires and all parts of the automobiles wear out very fast.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. My amendment allows for replacement.

Mr. KIRWAN. But the gentleman wants to cut out the purchase of some cars. How many would the gentleman's amendment cut out?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It would be 36 by this amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. All right. We cut them down 60 cars. I heard a number of Members here this afternoon speak highly of the Indians. Yet, if you want to see an Indian, or if somebody gets word that something is wrong with an Indian and wants to look at him, there would be no transportation. This is not for one little area. This is for all over the Western States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 12, line 12, strike out the word "including" and the remainder of line 12, all of line 13, and the words "excess of \$100" in line 14.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to an amendment I offered to another section of this bill earlier in the day and is intended to limit the per diem payment for extra individuals. It strikes out \$100 per day for the extra persons that you would employ in this Bureau under this legislation and limits their payment to \$50 per day.

I want to find out whether this great Committee is going to insist on \$100 per day for extra persons who are employed without any restrictions concerning their ability or qualifications. Of course, under this bill you leave that entirely to the head of the Bureau, or someone who represents him.

This amendment applies to an agency headed by Mr. Dillon Myer. There is

practically nothing in the hearings to support the need of this extra employment at the rate of \$100 per day. I do not believe a case has been made to support it. You ought to vote for my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I do not believe I understood from the reading of the amendment by the Clerk just how far the gentleman strikes out by his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am just striking out that portion which says in substance that you can pay \$100 a day for individuals to work for this particular Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman intend to strike out the figure \$5,000 there, too?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; that is the intention, and \$100 a day.

Mr. KEATING. I think perhaps the gentleman might want to look at his amendment again. It struck me, as the Clerk read it that perhaps it did not carry out the intention of the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, it does. It strikes out the \$5,000 and \$100 per day. If not we will amend it to limit the total amount to \$5,000 and \$100 per day.

There is nothing more that I care to say about this amendment. If you want to go along and pay these extra employees money without requiring qualification of any kind, that is up to you. But, I think this is a pretty good chance to determine whether you want to follow that principle or not.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 9 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is similar to the amendment that he offered in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration. You will note that the expenditure here is limited to the power and irrigation activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This is another example where careless amendments can bring about the reverse effect of economy. The gentleman from Kansas by his amendment has removed the limitation. You see, he has in effect brought about a situation where they spend any amount of money at \$50 a day. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, the gentleman said earlier in the day that there was no particular limitation with respect to the use of these funds that is to say, they could use them almost whenever they cared with reference to this particular agency.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The committee placed a limitation on the amount of money that could be spent both on Bonneville and the Indian Bureau. We limited it here to \$5,000. Now the gentleman by his amendment has removed the entire limitation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And says they cannot hire these people.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No; you have not. You better read your amendment. I will stand on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am against permitting a salary of \$100 a day for experts.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the principle and the precedent that is being set in this legislation and I think it would be wise to limit the per diem to around \$43 to \$50 a day.

Further, there are no qualifications set up in this bill to determine what constitutes an expert in his profession. The department head can employ anyone as an expert at \$100 a day.

I am of the opinion that if you need expert engineering to help the United States Army Engineers, who are supposed to be experts in the first place and capable of any construction that our Government needs, that you ought to be able to get these men for \$43 to \$50 a day.

You are setting a ceiling here of \$100 a day. I think you are laying yourselves and the Government, so to speak, open so that men can be appointed and doubtless will be appointed in many instances that are not experts but men who are probably recommended for these jobs as political favors. I think there is a chance for great abuse when you raise the ceiling to \$100 a day. I think there is a chance that the Government will not get value received. I doubt the necessity of it. I think it is establishing a very bad precedent. I hope you will limit the amount by approving this amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If you went to my home town of Pittsburgh and offered \$50 a day, you would not have a possible chance of getting a single qualified expert in any technical field for that sum. You might get one from the gentleman's State or his district; but in my district you would not have a chance of getting a single applicant.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise first to ask some questions.

The rate of \$100 a day for 300 working days a year would be at the rate of \$30,000 a year. Is not that pretty good for an expert, even if he is an expert on Indian affairs?

Second, I understand there are something over 300,000 Indians and we have about 12,000 people working in the Bureau. May I ask if that is not correct?



We have 12,000 employees, and I think that is 1 for every 34 Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. How many people are usually in an Indian family, about five?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not prepared to answer for certain, but I would say probably that is correct, about four or five.

Mr. FULTON. Each employee thus services five, or at most six, Indian families in a year. In addition, the United States is getting experts at a \$30,000-a-year rate, under this proposed bill, to treat on Indian affairs, and is also getting 227 passenger cars for this purpose. I do not believe the Indians when they were living their frugal, happy life here had so many people servicing them in passenger cars, when we came to the country, so it may be a new start for them. Perhaps the Indian needs practical education so he can do things himself more than he needs perennial bureaucratic coddling. We must not forget Indians are real people, not just a repressed problem minority.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think it would be difficult for this administration to convert a lame-duck Congressman into an Indian expert at \$100 a day, and do it rather rapidly?

Mr. FULTON. That might be a very good thing for some of them, as many leave here without much to go on, and without much to go back to, and no experts at \$100 a day to help them. I know we Congressmen are not being paid at that rate, and by the time you take our expenses into consideration, with long hours of work and pressures, we Congressmen cannot compete with such a stipend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps that explains the \$100 a day. Then they will get expenses on top of that.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman alludes to the gentlemen as being Indian experts. I might say, however, if \$100 a day were offered to experts on the Foreign Affairs Committee to take care of people over in foreign countries, there would not be too much objection to it.

Mr. FULTON. I think you would get objection to \$100 a day for any experts. Actually the experts on the staff hired by the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House get about one-third of that amount, without any additional allowances for expenses as here contemplated. I might say to the gentleman that if the Marshall plan was run at the rate of one Marshall-plan employee for every 34 persons helped, we certainly would have a staggering bureaucracy. The ECA is a very well-run organization, and we in Congress are proud of the job Paul Hoffman, Averill Harriman, and the present ECA Administrator Foster have accomplished.

Mr. FULTON. If they transferred some of the point 4 program for foreign fields over to the Indian country

in this country we would be better off, too, I might say.

Mr. FULTON. May I point out to the gentleman that the cost of the Indian Bureau the gentleman is now defending is more than the cost of running this whole legislative body, and the other body, the Senate, for a whole year. We in Congress must see our taxpayers' money is well spent. From the debate I have heard today it seems as if the poor Indian people who have suffered much, are not getting along too well in spite of the taxpayers' assistance and generosity.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, so that I may offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 12, line 14, strike "\$100" and insert "\$50."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to announce how I intend to vote on an amendment that I think will be offered to this bill. It happens I have been delegated by the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, to go down to Georgia and South Carolina to make an investigation at Fort Jackson, S. C., and Camp Gordon, Va. I may not be here when the features of the bill that I am particularly interested in are being discussed.

I understand there is going to be an amendment offered to reduce the amount for the Reclamation Bureau by 10 percent. I oppose such an amendment. I do not think that a cut straight across the board is the way to reduce expenses. It will be particularly bad in the Central Valley project of California. The Central Valley project is a good illustration of what our distinguished Speaker yesterday said about private and public power. There is room for both private and public power, and in my humble judgment both are needed to properly and efficiently develop the water power potential of the Nation. Some of us who have stood for so-called public power in the Central Valley water project are not Socialists by any manner of means.

The first appropriation for this project, which was approved by the people of California in 1933, was in 1935. The then President Roosevelt recommended that the Federal Government spend \$10,000 to study the project. Since that time we have spent \$440,000,000. It is the most fantastic water and power project in the world.

We intermingle the water from four watersheds. They are the Sacramento, San Juan, Kings, and Kern Rivers watersheds. This is done by taking water from the Sacramento, which has a surplus of water, and by a series of pumps and a cement lined canal, flowing it

southward and dumping it into the San Joaquin River, 109 miles south of where it was taken from the Delta Cross Canal in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. That is to replace water of the San Joaquin River which is being diverted by Friant Dam to the watersheds of the Kings and the Kern Rivers, the right to which water belongs to appropriators and riparian owners in the San Joaquin Valley.

Under the original plan, which the people of California voted for and approved overwhelmingly, there was a provision for transmission lines, to be operated by the State of California, which contemplated operating the project when it was completed.

I want to make it very clear at this point that there has been a contract made between the Reclamation Bureau and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. concerning transmission lines, whereby the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is to transmit over its lines certain electric power generated by the Reclamation powerhouses.

As I understand the contract, although I have not had a chance to read it, it looks satisfactory to me. But I still think there are certain transmission lines in the Central Valley water project which should be publicly owned. We do not want to be relegated in the sale of this great block of publicly generated power to one utility. I have no objection to public utilities. I recognize that they are a necessity. But after all there is no use shedding crocodile tears over the poor utilities. If you analyze the situation carefully you will all recognize that a utility is a cost-plus business. It was made so many years ago because it was thought that to have a monopoly was the best way to serve the public. And I concur in that premise. But after all, that is what they are—they are a cost-plus business. They not only are a monopoly, they are a monopoly chaperoned by the public utility commission. Their financial success is practically guaranteed by the public utility commission. But they sometimes overreach themselves. I have had personal experience in dealing with utilities. I have never said one antagonistic word against the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., but I have seen them overreach themselves.

I have seen them come before the railroad commission when we were trying to get the rates reduced, and cry to high heaven that the rates we proposed would confiscate the company's resources, would wreck their financial stability, and so forth. What happened? When they saw, or thought, they were going to lose the case they came in and voluntarily offered to reduce the rates, and they made good money and reasonable profits out of the reduced rates.

I merely mention these things so I can place myself on record with my people as to just where I stand. I think we should control the output of that electricity for the benefit of all the people of California, and not funnel it all through the channels of one public utility, even though that public utility is controlled and regulated very strictly by the California Utilities Commission.



I cannot go into details, but if there are certain transmission lines that are not completed, we should be allowed to complete those. If there are others which are necessary for us, I mean for the public, to hold control of where that public developed power should go, we should have that situation prevail. Everybody knows that many of the rivers, especially the rivers in California that I am talking about, could never have been developed under private enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sorry the gentleman is going to be away at such a crucial vote. I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for that part of his address which I have just heard.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

All I want to do is to see that the people of California in particular, and the taxpayers of the United States who are loaning the money to us, get the greatest benefit out of the development and resources of those rivers. The great perpetual resource of California and the whole western area is water; the rivers and the snows in the high mountains that feed the rivers in summer. This great project, as I said before, could never have been developed by private enterprise. The particular one I mentioned vigorously resisted the development of the Central Valley project. I do not want any private enterprise to go in there and skim off the cream and take care of a certain group of investors. That is not stating anything in a hostile way toward the utilities. But the principle is just wrong. We should spread the benefits as far as we possibly can and that is exactly what I believe the Reclamation Bureau is trying to do.

In our State we have grown so fast in the last 10 years that our population has increased over 50 percent to 10,586,223 people. Power is going to be short. Industries in large number are beginning to locate in California, and every kilowatt of power that we develop by private industry and by public enterprise will come back many times by virtue of this investment. It will all be needed. Consequently, I am very anxious that the appropriation which this great committee is asking, \$207,000,000 for the entire Reclamation Bureau, be not decreased, and especially not decreased on the Central Valley project.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I want to agree with the remark just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] to the effect that because of the immense increase in

population in California it is going to take all that both private and public power can do to meet the increased demand. I certainly concur in that statement, and I concur in the thought which the gentleman expressed that this body not decrease the amount of money necessary for this very necessary project.

Mr. JOHNSON. I appreciate that, because there is nobody who has a better grasp of California problems, and especially this problem, than the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Furthermore, all the money will be paid back to the Government by the water users and the electric users as the reclamation law requires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time and expediting the public business, I have a unanimous-consent request that I would like to propound.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have four additional amendments to the bill, all of which are identical in purpose and intent with the two amendments which were previously adopted and which were offered by me. The purpose of those amendments is to strike out authorization of funds in this bill for the acquisition of new automobiles over and above those which are to be used as replacements. I ask unanimous consent that all four of those amendments be considered at this time as a whole, notwithstanding the fact that they are applicable to parts of the bill which have not yet been read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be permissible for the Clerk to read the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opinion of the Chair. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendments, and then the Chair will put the request.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

Page 23, lines 21 and 22, strike out "117" and insert in lieu thereof "80."

Page 26, lines 7 and 8, strike out "151" and insert "130."

Page 29, line 9, strike out "22" and insert "19."

Page 31, line 21, strike out "85" and insert "74."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] asks unanimous consent that his four amendments be considered en bloc at this time even though the paragraphs of the bill to which the amendments refer have not yet been read.

Is there objection?

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he has in mind insofar as the Geological Survey is concerned that they have a great deal to do with the mineral resources of this country and quite directly, I think, with the defense effort and the war effort. I wonder if he might

consider perhaps omitting the amendment relating to that section?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to debate these amendments further. I believe the precedent has already been set by the adoption of the other two amendments identical in purpose.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of that part of the bill pertaining to the Indian Service, I was glad to hear so many appropriate and worthy sentiments expressed for our Indians. Apparently there is agreement as to what we would like for the Indians, which is that they be merged into our American way of life, being relieved of wardship and brought into first-class citizenship as soon as possible. That is my sentiment along with that of many colleagues.

We are not so unanimous in our views as to the best method of obtaining this desired goal for our Indians as we are apparently unanimous in the wished-for goal for them. To illustrate my meaning, it is desirable that every individual should know how to swim but I have heard different methods of having children acquire the desired ability to swim. I have even heard it suggested: "Throw a boy into the deep water, and he will swim." I do not know how effective that training would be, and I do not know that it is often practiced, but I am doubtful about it and do not advise it. On the other hand, I believe that there are other methods of training a child to swim, both safer and more effective.

So many times I have heard well-intentioned individuals say, "Turn the Indian loose." Or "We must emancipate the Indian." The first idea is a dangerous one; the second as an idea is more acceptable to me, but I do not like the word "emancipate" with all that it connotes applied to Indians.

Time will not permit now a report which three of us in this Chamber might give, as members of the watchdog committee on the Navajo measure appointed last year, and who have recently visited the Navajo Reservation, but I do want to say this: That your watchdog committee paid our first hurried visit to the Navajo Reservation just before Easter and saw some evidence, both of the need and the accomplishment, on which I wish later to report more fully. Concerning Navajo life, we saw the present depth and height of their condition. We saw them in their hogans and we saw them in one of the best modern schools which has been provided very recently for them.

Let me conclude by saying that I appreciate the fact that the Indian appropriations in this bill have received better



consideration at the hands of this committee than has any other part of this appropriation bill thus far read and amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

**BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other acts and treaties applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: Page 14, line 20, strike out the words "and treaties."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support my amendment at length and with considerable persuasiveness.

I have here the Mexican water treaty which I should like to read at length; I have the Boulder Canyon Project Act and other documents. But in view of the fact that this is a very minor amendment and is an appendage to the more important amendment which I will offer I think perhaps our chairman might accept it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Another year has rolled around, and we are again considering appropriations for the fiscal year. These appropriations will be for the fiscal year of 1952, beginning July 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1952.

The Second District of Colorado is always interested in the Federal budget and appropriations, and especially funds for the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

The Colorado-Big Thompson project, one of the outstanding irrigation and reclamation programs in the entire West, is now so nearly completed—more than 60 percent—that funds for this work should not and do not fall in the category of possible or promotion projects from any angle. Consequently, the supporters of this project insist that any curtailment of funds that in any way would delay the completion of this irrigation and power-producing project would be economic folly, and produce no economy in any way in the conduct of the Federal Government.

In 1950, which would be for the fiscal year 1951, the Budget Bureau requested a total of \$21,500,000 for the Big Thompson project, and were given \$20,172,750. This was a reduction from the request of \$327,250.

This year there is included in the budget request, \$19,300,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The House Appropriations Committee has approved \$19,000,000 for the project, which is \$300,000 less than the request. Of course we still have hopes that should contracts and the program be completed faster

than the funds indicate they would be, that a deficiency appropriation would be forthcoming. We all understand that our contracts lap over from year to year.

We hope the \$19,000,000 is enough to keep work in full progress during the coming 12 months.

Just to keep us all posted on what is going on in the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, the secretary-manager, Mr. J. M. Dille, writes me as of April 13, and I quote excerpts from his letter:

Dear CONGRESSMAN HILL: It occurs to me that you will be interested in a brief résumé of progress on the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

First, as to construction, you know that Granby Reservoir, Shadow Mountain Lake, Alva B. Adams tunnel, the Estes Park aqueduct, and Horsetooth Reservoir have been completed for several years.

In addition, the Granby pumping plant, Mary's Lake and Estes power plants, Horsetooth feeder canal and the Poudre supply canal leading to the Poudre River, are also now built and ready for use.

Other features in various stages of construction are the 7½ mile combined Olympus and Polehill tunnels, now excavated and being lined, the Polehill power plant, the Rattlesnake tunnel and afterbay, the Bald Mountain pressure tunnel and the Flatiron power plant.

The above are all parts of the "Foothills Power System" and the two power plants will be the largest producers in the system.

The Bureau is apparently expediting their completion as rapidly as possible.

Also, now being built are the Carter Lake Reservoir dams and the Carter Lake pressure tunnel through which the water will be pumped into Carter Lake from pumps at the afterbay of the Flatiron power plant.

Also, the Bureau is now in the process of receiving bids and awarding contracts on the Willow Creek Dam on Willow Creek and for the North Poudre gravity canal north of Fort Collins.

In a short time the Bureau will ask for bids on the St. Vrain supply canal and other smaller features.

The recent completion of work listed above makes possible partial, but substantial, operation of the project this season.

In fact, the Bureau is now pumping water from Granby Reservoir, flowing it through the Adams tunnel through the power plants in Estes Park down the Big Thompson River, and then through the Horsetooth feeder canal for storage in Horsetooth Reservoir.

The Bureau plans to continue these flows until about 35,000 acre-feet are in storage by June 1; then shut off for most of June to avoid high water in the Thompson River and resume operations in July and August. Of course, only a part of the water will have to be pumped from Granby Reservoir.

The diverted water will be available for rental through the district to irrigation systems on the Poudre and Big Thompson Rivers.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Is the gentleman going to have water for that project? When I was out there I was told it would take 10 years to bring up enough water to take care of the project. In other words, they are pumping water uphill out there.

Mr. HILL. Well. The only thing wrong with the gentleman's statement is that he says "I was told." I am sure he is not one of those Congressmen who believes everything he is told. If he will go out there and look over the project he will find one of the large lakes is being filled rapidly. When I saw it 3 or 4 weeks ago it was almost one-third full. We have been irrigating land through that project for the last 2 years and unless California takes all of the water from the upper Basin of the Colorado-Big Thompson River we will have plenty of water to do everything planned by this project.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct further attention to the amendment to the bill now under consideration by the Committee, which was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. Mr. SHORT's amendment reads:

On page 4, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

This amendment, if permitted to stand, will stop construction before completion on the following projects in southwestern Missouri: A transmission line from Carthage to Springfield, from Springfield to Mansfield, and from Springfield to a substation. It will also stop construction on the Mansfield switching station, the Clinton substation, and the Carthage substation.

These projects are already under construction and the total estimated cost is \$4,960,125. Of this amount, \$2,936,250 has already been appropriated and obligated. The amount requested for completion of these projects and the amount carried in the present bill is \$1,560,600. This amount would practically complete these projects. The The Short amendment does not strike out the \$1,560,600 but merely prevents this amount from being spent on the western Missouri projects. The amendment has no effect on the \$2,936,250 already provided in fiscal 1951. If allowed to stand, the Federal Government would stand to lose this \$2,936,250 by having construction on the projects stopped before their completion. Such action as the adoption of this amendment is indeed reckless and irresponsible.

I do not agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] that these facilities are duplication. I also do not agree that the area is at present adequately served. Neither of these contentions, duplication, or adequate service is justified by the facts in the case. The area does need additional facilities and also desperately needs a dependable source of electric energy at a reasonable cost. If this amendment stands, it means that REA in the area will be unduly restricted. It means that our rural people will not get the service they are entitled to have and the service they are willing to pay for. A vote for this



amendment, regardless of how loud the contention may be proclaimed otherwise, is a vote against REA, and thus against our rural people.

I will ask for a roll call vote on this amendment in the House and sincerely hope that the membership will vote the amendment down.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, referring to page 10 of the report I see under the head of "Central Valley project" the following language is used:

Testimony indicates that \$630,000 requested for Contra Costa distribution system was to be used for initiating construction of an aqueduct to serve the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District, which is within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utility District on the east side of San Francisco Bay. Owing to lack of agreement between two competing public agencies, the \$630,000 item under reference has been deleted from the approved program.

It goes on further to deny funds for this purpose.

In reading the hearings on this matter I see that the manager of the East Bay Municipal Utility District, which serves an area in Alameda County and in Contra Costa County, with an attorney here in Washington employed by them, appeared before the committee and made certain statements that were never rebutted because no one had an opportunity to rebut them. Perhaps I should have been there. However, they cannot be borne out in fact.

It is not particularly brought out in this report or in the hearings that the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District referred to as being in conflict with the East Bay Municipal Utility District is a political subdivision of the State of California, created by initiative of the people of that district who were not satisfied with the service they were getting from the East Bay Municipal Utility District. Therefore, in order to protect their own interests they utilized California law for that purpose.

I am sorry that the committee did not have before it, or that there was not an opportunity given to representatives of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District to appear and offer their side of the story. Knowing the subcommittee as I do, I doubt very much whether the stringent language written into this report would be there. I am pointing out to them that since the Contra Costa County canal was built a great portion of the territory at one time we thought would be agricultural land has become urban property. There will be a surplus capacity in the Contra Costa County canal, and that surplus capacity can be used to bring industrial water into one of the most rapidly growing parts of the United States.

I trust that in the future we will be able to correct the situation, but I want the RECORD to show now that I, as the representative of that district, cannot accept the conclusions of the committee. I am not charging the com-

mittee with trying to do something dishonorable, but it is my intention to lay before them in the future facts that I am certain will tend to change their mind and opinion on this matter and would have changed them if the matter had not been heard in an ex parte manner.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Nobody appeared before the committee and asked for this particular appropriation except the Department of the Interior, and we did have gentlemen from that area in California that very strenuously objected to it.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that. The new water district has just been erected. It was voted for and erected by an overwhelming vote of that district, and they are just in the process of getting organized, and this comes rather as a blow.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to compliment the gentleman for a very fine statement. I, as one member of the committee, will be very happy to hear from his representatives with reference to the matter that he has just discussed on the floor of the House. I am sure that all of the members of the committee will give very careful consideration to it when the matter is considered again. Again, I say, I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he has made.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to say to the Committee that there most likely will be a supplemental appropriation bill coming in, and at that time, if they are ready for it, I hope to see this item brought before that committee when we will have an opportunity of laying it then formally before the committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for several weeks the House Public Works Committee has been holding hearings on the controversial St. Lawrence waterway project to which I am unalterably opposed since it will serve no conceivable national good but to the contrary do irreparable damage to not only my district and State but to 85 percent of the Nation as a whole.

During the course of the hearings being conducted by the House Committee on Public Works, it has been rumored that the Army engineers have been roaming the hallways of Congress in a frantic effort to garner support for the already discredited St. Lawrence seaway project. It is said that they have

gone so far that they are offering many Members of Congress from the Southern States a \$100,000,000 tidewater channel and from the mouth of the Mississippi to New Orleans. This project is known as the New Orleans-Gulf waterway, and is being used as bait in the desperate effort to drum up votes for the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Edgar Poe, who is a columnist for the New Orleans Times-Picayune stated in the edition of March 11, 1951 that President Truman did a little lobbying for the St. Lawrence project when he was visited recently by Guy Easterly who publishes the weekly *LaFollette* (Tenn.) Press.

According to publisher Easterly, when the interview was about over President Truman drew from a pile of papers on his desk another sheaf and began to talk of his program of waterways, which included a plan to dig a big ditch at New Orleans and bring that city within 45 miles of the ocean, at a cost of \$100,000,000.

In commenting on the visit of Mr. Easterly to the White House, columnist Poe said there apparently is no question that President Truman personally is interested in the proposed tidewater ship channel from New Orleans to the Gulf. He wants to see it built, but at the same time he wants New Orleans and the lower Mississippi Valley to go along with him on the controversial St. Lawrence seaway.

Continuing his comment, Mr. Poe said that if New Orleans and lower Mississippi shipping interests are not willing to do some trading President Truman "stands ready to hold their feet to the fire." In other words it would be a big trade, concluded Mr. Poe.

Mr. Chairman, this is ugly business. The President is trying to effect a trade that involves a \$100,000,000 nondefense waterway project at the mouth of the Mississippi River in return for support on a \$1,000,000,000 economic monstrosity known as the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it is the business of the Army engineers to lobby or to bring pressure upon Members of Congress. Their job is to furnish Congress with information so that the elected Representatives of the American people can decide what is for the best interests of the American people as a whole.

Both of the above-named projects should not be considered at this time because of the necessity for conserving manpower, material, and money so badly needed in the defense effort.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can make a little progress on this bill and move along. We have been very fair. With the indulgence of the other Members of the House, I hope that for the balance of the



day there will be no more pro forma amendments, so that we can move on into the amendments that will be considered.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield, I hope we can do exactly as the gentleman from Washington has suggested. We have a lot of things to do. Let us get down to business.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 20, I note the words "and treaties."

This reminds me that last April 18 was the sixth anniversary of the ratification by the Senate of the Mexican Water Treaty. Quite fittingly, on that anniversary date, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs tabled by a 2 to 1 vote the proposed central Arizona project. It took 6 years for the Mexican treaty chicken to grow up and come home to roost, but it finally did.

The Mexican Water Treaty gave Mexico a million acre-feet more than she had ever used before, and did this by giving Mexico free of charge the benefit of storage in Hoover Dam which Congress had authorized on the promise that the water stored there would be used exclusively in the United States. Most of the water users in the Colorado River basin objected to it, but it was put through the Senate by Dean Acheson, the then Under Secretary of State. It was one more mistake of the tragic era in our foreign relations that produced the Yalta, Tehran, and Cairo agreements. The irony of the present situation is that this bad treaty was made possible only by the backing of the very same individuals who are now the promoters of the central Arizona project: Charles A. Carson, of Arizona, and Clifford H. Stone, of Colorado. They boosted the Treaty under the happy delusion that they were giving away California's water to Mexico. Mr. Acheson had been attorney for Arizona in the first Supreme Court suit—Two Hundred and Eighty-third United States Reports, page 423—to enjoin the construction of Hoover Dam and declare the Colorado River compact unconstitutional. The treaty rode through the Senate on the Acheson-Stone-Carson axis.

Now, 6 years later, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has ruled by a 2 to 1 vote that it will not consider the central Arizona project further until the water rights in the Colorado River have first been adjudicated by the Supreme Court, or agreed upon by the States. If this 1,000,000 acre-foot bonus had not been given to Mexico on the insistence of Mr. Carson, there might be water enough today for the central Arizona project.

The Mexican Water Treaty chicken, 6 years old, has come home to roost.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; for-

mulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$5,000,000, of which \$4,265,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 15, line 10, after the word "expended," strike out "\$5,000,000, of which \$4,265,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000, of which \$3,500,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to reduce the amount available for general investigations from \$5,000,000 to \$4,000,000. It is offered in the belief that in view of the over-all situation by which we are now confronted some of this work can well be deferred.

It is of course true, that the committee has already made a reduction of \$500,000 below the budget estimate and below the funds which were available for this purpose this year. But it is also true that the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for general investigations, which seems to me unduly liberal under present conditions.

If I read the hearings correctly, Mr. Chairman, there must be between two and three million dollars recommended under this item which refer not to any present programs, but to programs of the future.

For example, there is recommended in the neighborhood of a million dollars for advanced planning. There is also included, I think something like \$145,000 for reconnaissance, something like \$865,000 for basin surveys, and something like \$300,000 for general research.

These and other items account for between two and three million dollars.

Under general research I find that it is contemplated that the appropriation recommended shall be used to find solutions for various problems including studies of sediment transportation in streams, deposition in reservoirs, aggradation and degradation of stream beds above and below dams, reservoir evaporation studies, and studies of improved land use, soil management, and other similar studies.

Mr. Chairman, the items referred to, including these studies may be fully justified in normal times. They have their importance, but surely some of them can be deferred in view of present conditions.

The argument for deferment is emphasized by the fact that there appear to be between three and four billion dollars' worth of projects now available except for detailed plans and specifications as a backlog for subsequent completion.

This volume of projects will require a number of years for completion. Their completion date will, in all probability, be further in the future than now anticipated because of the great demand for steel and other materials, needed for national defense.

Mr. Wilson, Administrator of Defense Mobilization reports that demand for steel in the near future will be particularly heavy. Many projects, "even though helpful," he says, "must wait."

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the \$1,000,000,000 shelf of projects is an adequate shelf and that if we make \$4,000,000 available at this time instead of the proposed \$5,000,000 suggested by the committee, we shall be making ample provision for those investigations which are required at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered would reduce this appropriation \$1,000,000. The committee has already cut it \$500,000 from the budget estimate. It is the part of the bill which calls for surveys and investigations of potential reclamation development. There is no use letting this country go to seed and stop everything that is good for America. The Nation is in a crisis. There is nobody on this floor who can deny that we are in a crisis, and I repeat, this country must go forward. They were asking for \$5,500,000 for investigations and surveys throughout the Nation. The committee cut that half a million dollars. But it takes money to make these surveys and investigations. When this crisis is over we must be in a position where the country can move forward again. That is why I ask that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the money from the reclamation fund is derived from funds received from the sale of land and resources in the western country? Is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is true.

Mr. ASPINALL. And also the \$500,000 which is referred to in this part of the bill comes from the Colorado River fund, coming from revenues of the Hoover Dam; is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from



Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] prevails, the United States of America has given the magnanimous sum of \$265,000 for the future development of that great area. Is that right?

Mr. KIRWAN. I think that is correct. I am not condemning anybody, but in 1929, when the collapse came in this country—please do not get me wrong or think that I am blaming any political party for the collapse—but when it did come only 29 out of every 100 families in the United States had electricity in their homes. That was due to the lack of surveys and investigations to find out what was wrong with America. Today there are still 25 out of every 100 families in the United States that have no electricity. We must find out the reason for that and do something about it.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The \$500,000 in the Colorado fund is derived from the sale of power from the Hoover Dam?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. That is allocated to the Upper Basin States; is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. GRANGER. And what you are doing here is taking money that has been allocated by treaty and by agreement to the Upper Basin States and allocating that money to all the reclamation fund. Now, that is not fair.

Mr. KIRWAN. What we would be doing here with this amendment is stopping the progress of America. I do not care whether it is in California or Colorado or where it is, but anything you do that is injurious to one State hurts all the States. We have got to allow this Nation to go forward.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is exactly right. The \$500,000 included here is not tax money. It is not money taken out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. It is a trust fund that has been set up by law. So, to cut it in the interest of economy and saving the taxpayer is a mistake as well as a blunder.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is with the greatest of reluctance that I oppose this amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], for whom I have such affection. I am sure that he is not knowingly and deliberately seeking to do anything here today which would interfere with the development of reclamation in the West. I know he is sincere in the amendment which he offers. However, I feel constrained to oppose the amendment, and I hope the committee will reject it. I think the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropria-

tions has done a splendid job this year. I wish to commend the committee on the bill that is now before us.

This is always a controversial bill; this is a bill which involves appropriations for the West, and there are many Members of this body who are not familiar with the problems of Western States, and the necessity for the many different items appearing in this bill. For this reason there is always opposition to certain provisions of this annual Interior appropriation bill.

The committee has already reduced the amount for investigation by \$500,000. I do not know what prompted the committee to make that reduction. I am advised that the Bureau of Reclamation will need the full amount of \$5,500,000 if it is to continue the investigation work which is now in progress and which I think is absolutely essential. Some of these projects on which the Bureau is now working are important, not alone to the development of the West, but also to our defense effort. The preliminary investigation work on a project, when once started, should be carried on to its conclusion.

We in the West, and particularly in Colorado, at this moment are very much interested in this item for investigation work by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau has been doing a large amount of investigation work in Colorado, a good deal in my district, and considerable in the Fourth Congressional District so ably represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. This work has not been completed. Therefore this is an item in which we have a very keen personal interest.

It is obvious that the work of the Bureau will be seriously curtailed if this appropriation is reduced. I fear such a reduction would have a direct effect upon these investigations which are now under way in Colorado.

One of the projects on which the Bureau has been working upon is known as the Frying Pan-Arkansas project, which involves the transmountain diversion of water. This water will be used for domestic purposes as well as irrigation. Cities and towns are now short of domestic water, and every effort is being made to expedite action on this project. Every Member of this House realizes the importance of water to the development of the West. We have had two or three rather dry years in certain parts of the West; it is, therefore, all the more important that we appropriate sufficient funds so that the necessary investigation work on these reclamation projects can be continued. This is an item that should not be reduced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The observation which the gentleman made applies, I think, as well to the East as to the agricultural and arid sections of our country. We remember the experience New York City had only in recent months. The

water is vitally important in the life of all of us, and in connection with the activities of the many sections of our country.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No one, of course, would willingly do anything that would interfere with the proper development of the great West.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am sure the gentleman is correct. He has served on the Appropriations Committee for many years and has been a friend of the West. I consider him one of the most valuable members of that great committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his observation in that connection. I point out to the gentleman that according to the hearings we have on the shelf some \$4,000,000,000 worth of projects ready for subsequent construction and that the recommendation of the committee includes over a million dollars for advance planning work. It seems to me that is an excessive recommendation in the light of the situation which confronts us at this time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I will state to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the details as to just how this money will be spent. The sum of \$5,000,000 has been recommended. The Bureau had \$5,500,000 this year, and I believe the same amount should be given them for the next fiscal year.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The backlog of authorized projects on the shelf are not investigated. That is what this fund is for, to continue the planning and investigation of those projects which are on the shelf just like the ones in the upper basin which are now under consideration. Merely to have the projects on the shelf does not do the engineering and does not do the planning.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I would just like to add my support to my colleague from Colorado. One thing this House can do that I think will do more harm than anything else is to make up our minds not to investigate these projects thoroughly and completely for whatever length of time may be necessary to know what will happen when the projects are built.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I agree with my distinguished colleague. I hope this amendment will be voted down and the appropriation left at \$5,000,000. I would personally like to see the same amount provided as spent this year, or \$5,500,000. However, I am willing to go along with the committee on its recommendation. I feel it would be disastrous if there should be any further reduction made,



as contained in this amendment. I therefore urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 23, appear the words, "for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects."

I am advised that the Reclamation Bureau has already spent approximately \$1,500,000 on so-called engineering and economic investigations of the proposed central Arizona project. This is the project which the Secretary of the Interior has reported would cost the taxpayers of the United States \$2,075,000,000 in interest alone. The taxpayers of Arizona would pay three-eighths of 1 percent of that, and the taxpayers of the other States would pay 99½ percent. The share of the taxpayers of California would be over \$172,000,000; the taxpayers of New York would have to pay \$304,000,000; those of Pennsylvania \$158,000,000; those of Ohio \$119,000,000; those of Texas \$90,000,000; those of Illinois \$157,000,000 and so on. Since that time the Secretary of the Interior has increased the cost estimates 11 percent.

This is the same project which the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on April 18 ordered tabled until the water rights in the lower Colorado River are first determined by agreement or by adjudication of the Supreme Court.

I note that at page 15, line 20, appears the language:

No part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

The central Arizona project is not authorized by law.

I want some assurance that this \$1,500,000 already spent on investigations of the fantastic central Arizona project is the last money that will be poured down this rat hole. Otherwise, I shall insist that proof be offered of the legislative authority for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, and, unless satisfied on the point, will make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 78, noes 52.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$207,190,000, of which \$29,202,200 shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 16, line 2, strike out "\$207,190,000" and insert "\$197,000,000 and the cut below the

budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think there will be demand for more than 10 minutes to speak on this amendment. This is one of the most important amendments to the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) entitled "An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EMERGENCY FOOD RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 209, Rept. No. 381), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NEGROES

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 210, Rept. No. 382), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 314) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, GRANT, HOPE, and AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### MICHIGAN COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp commemorating the beginning of the modern history of Michigan. I have also personally brought this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General, who may authorize the issuance of such stamp, and I am enlisting the support of the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I serve, to intercede with the Postmaster General or to obtain action on this bill.

The beginning of the history of Michigan and the surrounding States is marked by the landing of Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac at the place where Detroit now stands.

The establishment of a fortified community in the Indian dominated wilderness has had such a far-reaching effect



on the development of the country and on the security and safety of the world that it is fitting such a commemorative stamp be issued.

Detroit, the "Arsenal of Democracy," had its beginning in this landing back in 1701. Today it is one of the Nation's and the world's largest metropolises and the center of the automobile industry and many other industries and businesses. Its people have the know-how for the production of the arms and sinews of our great national defense program.

I would like to insert in the *RECORD* a statement which appears in the book entitled "Michigan: A Guide to the Wolverine State" by the Oxford University Press. This statement, entitled "Cadillac and the Settlement of Detroit," points out the significance of this small beginning to the historical events which have followed:

#### CADILLAC AND THE SETTLEMENT OF DETROIT

In 1694, Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac was appointed commandant of the Michilimackinac post, which had become the most important trading center in the whole Northwest. From his point of vantage, Cadillac perceived that different methods were necessary to hasten development of the country and to circumvent the English, whose agents, seeking control of the Michigan area, constantly incited Indians to rise against the French and made illicit bargains with unscrupulous fur traders, to the detriment of the monopolists. Cadillac went to France in 1699 and obtained authorization to establish a fortified settlement at the "place du detroit"—the place of the strait. On July 24, 1701, he and a party of more than 100 reached the wooded shores of the strait where Detroit now stands; on that day the history of Michigan's development actually began.

The fortified community established by Cadillac and his men was named Fort Pontchartrain, in honor of the minister of marine. Six thousand Indians of various tribes set up villages in the vicinity of the fort, which within a year attained major importance as a trading post. Notwithstanding its prosperity, the administrative expenses, borne by the government of the mother country, were so heavy that on several occasions there was talk of abandoning the settlement.

Cadillac had been promised full authority in this region, but on October 31, 1701, the Company of the Colony of Canada was granted the exclusive right to trade at Detroit. The following year the fur trade was wrested from Cadillac. The dispute that arose was settled in 1706, when Cadillac was given control of the trade of the strait, and the company was accorded similar privileges in the remainder of the Michigan peninsula.

Hampered by the rigid control exercised by the ministers at Versailles, Cadillac's position was made still more difficult by the hostility of the missionaries. Sale of liquor to the Indians was a source of endless friction between the church and colonial officers. Charges were brought against Cadillac in 1704, and he was detained many months at Quebec before being exonerated. In 1710, he was removed, "by promotion," to the governorship of Louisiana, where he carried out some of the plans he had contemplated for Fort Pontchartrain.

After his departure, Fort Pontchartrain, or Detroit, as the settlement was beginning to be called, underwent 20 years of mismanagement at the hands of inefficient and sometimes venal commandants. Trade declined, a large number of settlers left, and one commandant foolishly reduced the fort

to about half its original size, leaving many outlying householders exposed to British-inspired Indian raids that began in 1712.

No serious attempt was made to reorganize administration of the settlement until 1729, when Robert Navarre, superintendent, was appointed to discharge certain limited notarial duties. This first instance of the exercise of civil jurisdiction within the borders of Michigan, reflecting a new policy on the part of the absentee rulers, proved a welcome diversion from military absolutism.

Though there were frequent alarms and occasional raids by Indians, the population of Detroit increased steadily. Many of those who arrived during the 1730's and 1740's settled outside the town. They were loath to go far inland, and, since the lands directly east of the community were already taken by the French settlers (see Detroit), while those to the west were set aside for friendly natives, many of the newcomers crossed the strait to farm the rich lands opposite Detroit. About 650 inhabitants, including 100 soldiers, lived in Detroit proper in 1750.

Growth of the strait community and the expansion of the farm lands in its immediate vicinity were checked by the outbreak of the French and Indian War in 1754. Although Michigan was somewhat removed from the fighting zone, many of its inhabitants took part in campaigns in Ohio and western Pennsylvania. The war ended in 1760 with the French surrender to the English at Montreal. Martial law prevailed throughout the territory until ratification of the Treaty of Paris in 1763.

Maj. Robert Rogers, leader of a band of rangers who had served the British as scouts, raiders, and envoys in Indian affairs, was sent out to receive the surrender of Detroit. He entered the town November 29, 1760, after taking other fortifications along the Great Lakes. The following month he went East, leaving Capt. Donald Campbell as first British commandant of the post.

The *SPLAKER*. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the House again on the prosthetic appliances exhibition that will be given by the National Advisory Committee on Artificial Arms and Legs, by the Advisory Committee to the Veterans' Administration on Prosthetic Appliances, and by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and myself.

May I remind the House of the very remarkable service the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] rendered when he succeeded in having indicted some manufacturers who were using very unfair practices in their sale of artificial limbs. They were violating the Sherman antitrust law. They were charging veterans and others far too much. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], as chairman of a subcommittee on labor, succeeded in having that practice stopped. It took courage and ability and he deserves an enormous amount of credit from both veterans and civilians for his work in connection with prosthetic appliances. The gentleman is far too modest about his accomplishments. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and chairman of a subcommittee of that committee, he has performed a very great service for

all with physical handicaps. And also as a member of the Advisory Committee on Prosthesis to the Veterans' Administration.

I hope all Members will go to the caucus room and see the remarkable demonstration in the use of prosthesis, made by veterans who have given their arms and legs, at 10 o'clock Thursday, May 10.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials from the Bridgeport Post, of Bridgeport, Conn.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include four editorials.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York and Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement of W. D. Johnson, vice president and national representative of the Order of Railroad Conductors, made before the Committee on Public Works this morning.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a column written by him in a local newspaper.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address entitled "Pattern for Survival."

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Denver Post of Friday, April 20, 1951.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a tribute by Quen-



tin Reynolds to Gen. Philip Fleming, recently appointed Ambassador to Costa Rica.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole on yesterday, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. DURHAM, and Mr. WEICHEL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include editorials.

Mr. BROWNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Service Club of Indianapolis.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. IRVING (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Wednesday, April 25, on account of illness.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

#### BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and a bill of the House of the following titles:

On April 24, 1951:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution making an emergency appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

On April 25, 1951:

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

403. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Ark.," to the Committee on Agriculture.

404. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, relative to a request by the University of Florida for the loan of a model of the U. S. S. *Florida* (BB-30) for exhibition purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

405. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

406. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$39,800 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 116); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

407. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a suggested draft of legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3842, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Communist "peace" offensive pursuant to Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2929. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 803. A bill to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and trans-

scripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 209. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3791, a bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 210. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 314, a bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 3842. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3843. A bill to amend sections 2, 4, and 5 of the act of August 5, 1949, entitled "An act to authorize the adjustment of lineal positions of certain officers of naval service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 3844. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3845. A bill to authorize for an additional 2-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and bridges over such canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3846. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the beginning of the history of Michigan and that northwest area marked by the landing of Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac and his party on July 24, 1701; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 3847. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to School District No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent-in-fee to certain Indian land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3848. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to make the publication 100 Things You Should



Know About Communism Series, etc., a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Res. 208. Resolution providing for investigation of low-flying airliners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. Res. 211. Resolution authorizing the printing of the address by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur before the joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives on April 19, 1951; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3849. A bill for the relief of Max Kassner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 3850. A bill for the relief of Dr. Zbigniew Sobol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3851. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marian Zawirski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H. R. 3852. A bill for the relief of Shigeto T. Ohmura and Mrs. Satsuyo Ohmura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Katsutoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 3854. A bill for the relief of Mrs. LaVerne F. Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3855. A bill for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Denny Payne Quilliam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Vanin Romildo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3858. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3859. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Kurth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

255. Mr. GOODWIN presented a resolution requesting the Congress to enlist the aid of the State Department to bring about the return of certain Greek children kidnapped by the Communists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.